

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PROCLAMATION OF EQUAL RIGHTS  
FOR THE HANDICAPPED

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Dr. Andrew S. Adams, the recently installed U.S. Commissioner of Rehabilitation, in a June 5 speech at the New York City Mayor's Conference on Consumer Issues and Actions Affecting the Handicapped, issued a Proclamation of Equal Rights for the Handicapped. Dr. Adams quite properly stressed that the litany against discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or sex must now include also physical or mental handicap. It merits reading. I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION OF EQUAL RIGHTS FOR THE  
HANDICAPPED

(By Dr. Andrew S. Adams)

The day of ignorance is past in matters related to the daily activities of physically and mentally handicapped people. Throughout the United States, we must guarantee equal opportunities under the Constitution to employment, housing, health care, transportation, education, use of public accommodations, recreation, and access to cast an election ballot regardless of their physical and mental condition.

These are the eight freedoms I seek for my fellow disabled citizens. Rehabilitation is a vital part of our lives, as it provides a path for our return to dignified and productive pursuits. But, it is not enough to prepare us to return to communities that perpetuate institutional, and individual, attitudes that restrict our inherent rights.

We must continue to expand opportunities for all disabled people. Discrimination works in subtle ways, often beyond the noble concepts of our Constitution, and too often beyond the consciousness of our fellow citizens. Discrimination may or may not be a matter of intention. Either way, I look for the day when discrimination for physical or mental handicap, like poliomyelitis, is basically a disease of the past in America. I look for the day when men no longer judge their fellows on the irrational basis of physical or mental handicap.

Recognizing the need for a restatement of our fundamental rights under the Constitution, I call for a nationwide proclamation of eight freedoms for all physically and mentally handicapped people.

These basic freedoms are:

1. The right to Employment.
2. The right to Education.
3. The right to Housing.
4. The right to Transportation.
5. The right to use Public Accommodations.
6. The right to Recreation.
7. The right to Health Care.
8. The right to access to cast an Election Ballot.

As other segments of our population have petitioned for recognition, let us do the same for disabled Americans as legislated in the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Indeed, let it be

known that henceforth, there shall be no discrimination based on race, creed, age, ethnic origin, gender . . . and physical or mental handicap.

H. R. GROSS: HAIL AND  
FAREWELL

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, when the final bells sound adjournment of the 2d session of the 93d Congress, later this year, they will also sound the close of one of the most unusual and outstanding congressional careers this Chamber has ever known. The bells will mean many things; they will also mean that H. R. Gross, our friend and beloved colleague from Iowa, will be with us no longer, as he has announced his retirement.

The American taxpayer is losing one of their best friends in the Congress. As the following article from Nation's Business, June 1974, points out:

As a self-appointed guardian of the public purse, it is conservatively estimated he has saved the taxpayer hundreds of millions of dollars. The total may even run into billions.

It is a fitting tribute to a man whom we all admire, respect, and will miss very, very much.

The article follows:

## THE HOUSE IS LOSING ITS "CONSCIENCE"

(By Vernon Louviere)

Some years ago, when a bill creating the National Foundation of Arts and Humanities came up for debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, a somber H. R. Gross listened impassively to the preliminary discussion.

The bill, among other things, called for federal subsidies to promote such art forms as painting, creative writing and dancing.

Finally, Mr. Gross rose and spoke:

"Mr. Chairman, I regret that I did not anticipate this bill would come up this afternoon or else I would have tried to appear in my tuxedo and my dancing shoes to be properly equipped for this further going-away party for the Treasury of the United States."

Then, Rep. Gross offered an amendment which he had drafted with the help of a fellow Congressman, a physician.

After the word "dance" in the bill he wanted these words inserted: "Including, but not limited to, the irregular jactations and/or rhythmic contraction and coordinated relaxations of the serrati, obliques and abdominalis recti group of muscles, accompanied by rotary undulations, tilts and turns, timed with and attuned to the titillating and blended tones of synchronous woodwinds."

He let the words sink in, waited for maximum effect, and spoke again: "That means belly dancing." The House broke up.

With such wit, the diminutive Iowa Republican has for 25 years sought to scuttle legislation whose purpose he feels is to spend for the sake of spending or for some other unnecessary reason. On this day he lost. Still,

his record of saving taxpayer money has been phenomenal.

As a self-appointed guardian of the public purse, it is conservatively estimated he has saved the taxpayer hundreds of millions of dollars. The total may even run into billions.

Now, Harold Royce Gross, the "Conscience of the House," is retiring at age 75.

Nothing is sacred to Mr. Gross if it calls for spending federal money. He has even questioned the taxpayers' picking up the tab for maintaining the eternal flame over the grave of President John F. Kennedy.

## "FT. FUMBLE" CATCHES IT

In his folksy, blunt newsletter to constituents, "Uncle Sam" often becomes "Uncle Sucker" or "Uncle Handout." He dismisses the Pentagon as "Ft. Fumble."

He has consistently fought pay raises for members of Congress—including, of course, himself. Mr. Gross has voted against every proposed boost in Congressional salaries since they were at the \$12,500 level. (The lawmakers now are paid \$42,000 a year, plus extras.) He is not above embarrassing his colleagues, twitting their consciences, on the subject. Last February, attacking an abortive move to jump the Congressional salary level to \$52,800, he told the House:

"At a time when many segments of our nation and its people are faced with unemployment and belt-tightening, it is inconceivable that fattening the payroll of upper echelon federal executives, federal judges and members of Congress would even be proposed."

Mr. Gross has never accepted the advice of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn of Texas, usually offered to rookie Congressmen: "To get along, you go along."

He has always functioned in the House as though every federal dollar spent is his own, or at least his neighbor's. He'll take on a President with no less relish than a middle-level bureaucrat. More often than not, he votes against Presidential money requests and he doesn't care which party the President belongs to.

A Western Republican Congressman discovered how this kind of Gross bipartisanship works. One day he praised "good old H.R." for ripping into a Democratic bill. The next day he was overheard complaining about that "old s.o.b., H. R. Gross" after the latter had torpedoed one of the Westerner's bills.

"How much will this boondoggle cost?" is the way Mr. Gross generally kicks off his questioning on the House floor when he suspects a bill's sponsor is trying to put something over on the taxpayer.

## READING THE FINE PRINT

Nothing seems to elude his hawk-eyed attention to fine print in the myriad of bills and resolutions which come up for House action. Few members of Congress will read every bill, as he does.

Take the time, for example, when Mr. Gross focused on a Foreign Service retirement benefits bill that emerged from the Foreign Affairs Committee. He seized on a phrase, "other purposes," and bore in. The "other purposes," it turned out, cleverly concealed the fact that the bill also would jump Congressional retirement benefits a whopping 33½ per cent. When H. R. Gross was finished with his attack, so was the bill. It was killed.

Anyone less skilled in the workings of the House, or who failed to do his legislative homework, would not long survive in the role of Treasury watchdog in which Mr. Gross has cast himself. Even his detractors concede that few, if any, Congressmen know House procedure as well as he. If Mr. Gross has not

memorized those documents which determine how all House business is conducted—the Constitution, the House rules, Thomas Jefferson's Manual and the 11 volumes of Precedents of the House of Representatives—he can put his finger on an applicable section in moments.

He has introduced relatively little legislation, has never been a committee chairman and serves in no other leadership role.

However, his influence is strongly felt, especially when it can be anticipated that the Gross scalpel will be drawn.

"I attend many committee hearings in which the chairman will study a bill to make sure we can answer the knotty questions Gross will ask," one Congressman relates. "Many times, items will be dropped before the bill hits the floor because of him."

Except for party leaders, none of the 435 members of the House have assigned seats. But over the years no other member has tried to occupy the "Gross seat" located strategically in the third row, under the nose of the Speaker of the House, on the middle aisle which separates Republicans from the Democrats. Rarely absent, the Iowa Congressman arrives on the floor before the daily session starts, sits through the chaplain's prayer and the reading of the journal of the previous day's proceedings. Then the House starts to come alive. H.R. Gross sits and waits. Some days his questions come fast and furious. Some days he says nothing. But he's always ready to spring into action.

#### EYES ON CONSENTS

To appreciate Mr. Gross' dedication to his job one would have to be in the House gallery on the two days each month when the House takes up the Consent Calendar. On these occasions flocks of bills, sometimes numbering in the hundreds, are called up and passed, without debate, by "unanimous consent."

All the bills are presumed to be noncontroversial—none involves expenditures of more than \$1 million—and attendance on the House floor is sparse. But H.R. Gross is there.

A single objection stalls action on a bill, scheduling it for a second Consent Calendar appearance. Then, objections by three Congressmen can force it into the regular order of House business where it will get more attention, and from a more representative group of lawmakers.

Over the years, Mr. Gross has torpedoed countless bills on the Consent Calendar. If his first objection doesn't lead a measure's sponsor to abandon it, Mr. Gross is sure to find two allies for the second round. And the sponsor had better be prepared to defend the bill when it comes up in the regular order of business.

The peppery Iowan will fight to save a few thousand dollars with no less vigor than he will challenge a multibillion-dollar appropriation to run a super federal agency.

Some years ago, a fellow Congressman introduced a bill to create a special flag for House members—it could be used on their autos. Not much money was involved and no one opposed the idea. Except H. A. Gross, that is. Delving into the matter, he discovered that the bill's sponsor really wanted the flag so it could be flown on a yacht he owned. Revealing this didn't do the bill much good on the House floor, but a single question from Mr. Gross about the flag's use on cars was probably what killed the measure:

"Where would you fly the House flag, above or below the coon tail on the radiator cap?"

Mr. Gross has been an implacable foe of foreign aid. Once, he told the House:

"I swear I think that what we ought to do is pass a bill to remove the torch from the hand of the Statue of Liberty and insert a tin cup."

One day in September, 1967, he offered a series of amendments to that year's foreign aid bill. A total of \$588.8 million was slashed as a direct consequence.

#### TV'S IN THE JUNGLE

Mr. Gross wrote a March, 1968, NATION'S BUSINESS article entitled, "We Certainly See Some Silly Spending." Here's an excerpt showing his use of wit to attack a federal program:

"Over at the Agency for International Development, which is skilled in getting rid of taxpayers' money on so-called foreign aid, somebody discovered that \$400,000 had been overlooked in the agency's customary spending spree."

"What to do?"

"Why, run out and buy 1,000 TV sets so that the natives in some jungle could be educated, a bureaucrat suggested. So AID bought 1,000 TV's."

"When the House Government Operations Committee looked into it, foreign aid officials had to admit they hadn't even bothered to find out which natives were suffering from a lack of television, how they were going to get the sets to operate in the jungle (the one they bought wouldn't work on batteries) or what they were going to show the natives if they managed to get the sets operating."

"More recently, these same AID dispensers rushed around in a crash program to set up a TV propaganda network for South Viet Nam. As a sop, they told American taxpayers that our GI's would also benefit because the network would have two channels—one for domestic propaganda, the other for 'Gun-smoke' and 'I Love Lucy.'"

"You can imagine what happened. The Vietnamese took one look at the stuff on their channel and promptly switched over to 'Gunsmoke.'"

"Why not? Marshal Matt Dillon has been around a lot longer than Marshal Ky."

Rep. Bo Ginn (D.-Ga.) says of his colleagues: "Mr. Gross is more than a Congressman. He is a one-man investigating force dedicated to protecting the taxpayer's pocketbook. He is scrupulous, untiring, uncompromising and dedicated to the public good."

And from another House Democrat, Louisiana's Rep. Otto Passman, this appraisal: "Gross has slowed down the trend to socialism from a run to a walk."

#### SINKING OF "FISH POND"

For years, the late Rep. Mike Kirwan of Ohio, a powerful Democrat, sought Congressional approval to build a \$10 million national aquarium on the banks of the Potomac. Every time it came up for House consideration H.R. Gross poked fun at the "glorified fish pond. It was never built."

In the twilight of his Congressional career, Mr. Gross is deeply concerned about the fiscal posture of the country.

"I've seen the budget pass the \$100 billion mark, then the \$200 billion mark," he says. "Now we have a \$304 billion budget with a \$10 billion built-in deficit. Can we ever turn this thing around?"

The White House alone is not responsible, he points out: "Congress shares the blame for this. No President can spend money that's not made available to him by Congress."

Few things rankle Mr. Gross more than supplemental appropriation bills—measures which come up near the end of each session to enlarge funds previously appropriated to operate government agencies. He comments:

They [the Executive branch] bring in a bill at the beginning of the year and swear on a stack of Bibles, 'This is it.' They know better, because they invariably come back in a few months and ask for more."

#### DOLEFUL ABOUT THE DEBT

The Congressman is doleful about the federal debt, now \$500 billion (interest alone is \$30 billion a year) and going up. Where, he is asked, will it all end?

His reply: "It ends in a takeover and repudiation of some form or another—revaluation, devaluation or outright repudiation."

He adds: "We've been financing this government off the printing presses at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. This is printing press money and there is no productivity behind that kind of money."

Mr. Gross estimates the combined total of public and private debt in the United States at between \$2 trillion \$200 billion and \$2 trillion \$400 billion.

"We are the most debt-ridden country in the world," he asserts. "Our federal debt alone is more than the combined governmental debts of the rest of the world."

"What a paradox: Here is the most developed country in the world in debt up to its ears!"

Few people in or out of Congress remember a piece of legislation—no matter how important or historic—by its designated number. But mention H.R. 144 to any member of Congress and he is familiar with it. Since his early days in the House, Mr. Gross has introduced House of Representatives bill 144 (the number is keyed to his name—a gross equals 12 dozen, or 144) at the start of each session.

It has a simple objective: Balance the budget and gradually retire the national debt. Year after year, it is shunted off to the Ways and Means Committee and promptly forgotten.

Now, H.R. 144 probably will be retired—like Red Grange's legendary football jersey number, 77, at the University of Illinois—unless some other member of the House, with the same zeal for economy, takes up the Gross cause.

#### "DUTCH" WAS A COLLEAGUE

Born on a southern Iowa farm, H. R. Gross started out as a reporter with the old United Press after World War I service in France, moved over to the editorship of a National Farmers Union newspaper and, in 1934, signed on as news director and newscaster with radio station WHO in Des Moines. A young sportscaster and announcer on the staff was Ronald "Dutch" Reagan, now Governor of California.

During his six years with WHO, Mr. Gross was a frequent defender of the Iowa farmer. His name became a household word across the state.

In 1940, he decided to run for Governor against an incumbent Republican. But party leaders, whom he had not consulted, opposed him and he lost in the primary.

He went back to radio, this time in Cincinnati. In 1948, now living in Waterloo, Iowa, he got the political itch again and ran for Congress. And again Republican leaders opposed him in the primary, even branding him a "radical leftist." But he won the primary and went on to win the general election by 20,000 votes. Except for 1964, in the landslide Lyndon Johnson election (he was the only one of six Iowa Republican Congressmen to survive it), Mr. Gross has easily won reelection to 12 terms in the House.

He regrets only one of the votes he's cast in his quarter-century in Congress.

"That was on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution," he says. "I thought I smelled something. I didn't like to vote against the President of the United States so I voted present."

Mr. Gross says the resolution, which paved the way for President Johnson to broaden the war in Viet Nam was "contrived."

"We were very badly misled," he adds. "Mr. Johnson said Asian boys would fight for Asian soil and later McNamara [former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara] promised to bring our boys back by Christmas in 1965."

#### THE SIMPLE LIFE

Mr. Gross and his wife, Hazel, live a simple life in Washington. They avoid the capital's social scene—"I've never owned a tuxedo and my wife has no ball gown," he says. "We don't need them." Mrs. Gross often reads

government documents, marking sections she feels her husband will want to read.

Perhaps, in a retirement for which he has no definite plans, Mr. Gross will travel abroad. But if he does, it won't be in the fashion of some of his colleagues. He has long fought, unsuccessfully, to curb what he and other critics call Congressional "junketing." Once, an Ohio Congressman facetiously sponsored a resolution to create a committee, consisting only of H.R. Gross, to inspect American foreign aid programs overseas.

The resolution, of course, went nowhere—and neither did Mr. Gross.

"I just might take a trip one of these days, but it'll be at my own expense," the Congressman explains.

Two signs in the Capitol Hill office of this man who has won many battles, but never the war, in an unrelenting campaign to eliminate wasteful government spending, succinctly spell out a message he has been trying to put across for 25 years:

"Nothing is easier than the expenditure of public money. It does not appear to belong to anybody. The temptation is overwhelming to bestow it on somebody."

"There is always free cheese in a mousetrap."

#### SUPREME ARROGANCE

### HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Mr. President, the June 2 edition of the *Richmond Times-Dispatch* included an excellent editorial concerning the stand taken by the Governor of Virginia against an effort by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare to force him to relinquish part of his statutory responsibility.

Under cover of an effort to insure against alleged racial discrimination in Virginia's institutions of higher education, HEW sought to require that the Governor make a commitment to appoint to the colleges' board of supervisors any blacks recommended by the presidents of the institutions.

Gov. Mills E. Godwin rightly refused to make any such commitment, pointing out that it would amount to a surrender of his legal responsibility for appointments.

As the *Times-Dispatch* states in its editorial, there are "frightening implications" in the demand by HEW. If a Federal agency should succeed in nullifying Virginia laws, it could take similar action in other States.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, "Supreme Arrogance," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### SUPREME ARROGANCE

The most recent exchange of correspondence between Gov. Mills E. Godwin, Jr. and the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare on the desegregation of Virginia colleges contains a shocking illustration of the extreme lengths to which HEW is willing to go to impose its supremely arrogant views. In effect, HEW has asked the governor to violate his oath of office, violate the Virginia Constitution and violate the statutes of this state to satisfy the de-

partment's demands for racial quotas. It will come as no surprise to most Virginians that Governor Godwin has told HEW that he has no intention of complying with its incredibly imperious edict.

HEW stated its demand in a letter from Peter E. Holmes, director of its Office of Civil Rights. As partial proof that Virginia's state-supported colleges and universities are racially unbiased, Mr. Holmes sought from Governor Godwin a "commitment" that he would appoint to these institutions' boards of visitors any blacks recommended by the institutions' presidents.

Under Virginia law, the power to appoint members of boards of visitors is vested in the governor. The State Constitution commands the governor to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." Governor Godwin could not surrender any part of his appointive powers and responsibilities without violating the statutes, the Constitution and his solemn oath of office. He is free to receive recommendations from any source, including college and university presidents, but he cannot legally commit himself to follow such advice. Virginia's laws on this matter have not been invalidated by any court, and as long as they remain in force the governor must observe them. This fact Governor Godwin made absolutely clear in his response to Mr. Holmes last week.

"The appointment of members of public boards is a statutory responsibility vested in this state's chief executive and I cannot bind myself in advance to accept recommendations from whatever source they may come," the governor wrote. "In short, I cannot abdicate this responsibility. As governor, I make appointments to boards based upon the qualifications of the individuals appointed. To do otherwise would be contrary to my oath of office and compromise my own conscience."

Governor Godwin noted that "substantial progress has been made in the last several years in the appointments of blacks to the boards of visitors of the predominantly white institutions. I made the first such appointment as governor in 1966."

In the Senate, Virginia Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. took the floor to inform his colleagues of HEW efforts to invalidate, by bureaucratic decree, the state laws involved.

"No responsible governor could acquiesce in such a demand," Senator Byrd said. "I commend the governor for his sound and forthright position. And I condemn HEW for its demand that Virginia's governor surrender his legal responsibility for appointments."

The frightening implications of HEW's demand should be clearly understood. Should a bureaucratic agency succeed in nullifying Virginia laws, it could nullify laws in all other states. If HEW is permitted to exercise such awesome power, it will have usurped the functions of the judiciary; and the possible consequences, for the entire nation, are horrendous.

DEFENSE COSTS OVERRUNS  
AMOUNT TO \$26 BILLION—A  
"DOUBLE WHAMMY" FOR TAX-  
PAYERS

### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office recently reported that 55 new weapons systems have created more than \$26 billion in cost overruns.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat of Wisconsin, who released the GAO report, said:

The result is a double-whammy for the taxpayer—who pays higher taxes and receives less defense for the dollars spent.

The Tennessean in a recent article to the Nashville Banner in a recent editorial discussed these overruns. The Banner in its editorial called for a careful study, "line by line" of these costs, their cause and cure.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place the editorial and article in the *RECORD* herewith:

[From the Tennessean, June 3, 1974]

BILLIONS IN RUNAWAY DEFENSE COSTS—  
DOUBLE WHAMMY ON JOHN Q.

(By Lawrence L. Knutson)

WASHINGTON.—The General Accounting Office says the development of 55 new weapons systems has brought on cost overruns totaling \$26.3 billion so far.

The new estimate represents a \$7 billion increase during the last half of 1973 alone.

According to the GAO figures, the original estimates to develop the new weapons totaled \$111.6 billion, but the cost is now seen as \$134.2 billion.

Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., who released the congressional agency's report yesterday, said that 13 of the 55 systems showed significant dropoffs in anticipated performance, while only four showed improvement.

According to the GAO figures, costs of the B-1 bomber rose by \$1.67 billion.

Other large overruns noted were \$1.43 billion for the F-15 and \$756 million for the Minuteman III missile.

Also included were \$417.9 million for the SAM-D missile, \$349.9 million for the UTTAS helicopter, \$394.1 million for the XM-1 tank, and \$189.7 million and \$91.6 million for parts of the Airborne Warning and Central System.

Proxmire said the costs of building the DD 963 destroyer have risen from the original planning estimates of \$1.8 billion to a current \$3.1 billion estimate.

"That is an increase of more than 70% and not a single ship has been completed," Proxmire said.

He said the unit cost of each ship has risen from an estimate of \$60 million to \$102.6 million.

Costs also have risen sharply for development of the Safeguard antiballistic missile system, he noted.

The original planning estimate called for spending \$4.2 billion for two sites. The new estimate is \$5.4 billion for one site.

Proxmire released the GAO survey in a speech prepared for delivery today in the Senate.

"In any other agency heads would roll and drastic changes would be made to halt the runaway costs and program failures occurring daily in the Pentagon," Proxmire said.

One of the most distressing facts is that the quantity cutbacks have usually been made because of the cost overruns," he said. "The Pentagon is being forced to buy less while spending more because of its inability to control costs."

"The result is a double whammy for the taxpayer," Proxmire said. "He pays higher taxes and receives less defense for the dollars spent."

[From the Nashville Banner, June 3, 1974]

COST OVERRUNS: OUT THE ROOF

There once was a movie entitled, "Who's Minding The Mint"—a comedy about someone stealing \$1 million.

There is today a real-life drama, which

could be entitled, "Who's Minding The Money"—a tragedy about someone letting weapons systems overruns pile up to a staggering \$26.3 billion.

At least, that's the case if the Pentagon watchdog, U.S. Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., is correct in figures he released.

Sen. Proxmire says the figures are from the General Accounting office and include rundowns on 55 new weapons systems.

The original estimates were in the neighborhood of \$111.6 billion. Now the estimates have hit the \$134.2 billion plateau and are still climbing.

Not only are there monumental cost overruns, Sen. Proxmire said, but 13 of the systems have shown significant performance dropoffs and only four showed any performance improvement.

In one instance the DD 963 destroyer program costs have risen from planning estimates of \$1.8 billion to a current \$3.1 billion, an increase of 70 per cent. The unit cost has gone from \$80 million to \$102.6 million.

The B-1 bomber rose by \$1.67 billion; the F-15 aircraft by \$1.43 billion; the Minuteman III missile by \$756 million; the SAM-D missile by \$417.9 million; the UTTAS helicopter by \$349.9 million; the XM-1 tank by \$394.1 million; and parts of the Airborne Warning and Central System by \$189.7 million and \$91.6 million.

And costs for developing the Safeguard antiballistic missile system have skyrocketed from \$4.2 billion for two sites to \$5.4 billion for one site.

"In any other agency," said Sen. Proxmire in releasing the figures in a speech on the floor of the U.S. Senate today, "heads would roll and drastic changes would be made to halt the runaway costs and program failures occurring daily in the Pentagon."

"One of the most distressing facts is that the quantity cutbacks have usually been made because of the cost overruns. The Pentagon is being forced to buy less while spending more because of its inability to control costs."

"The result is a double-whammy for the taxpayer. He pays higher taxes and receives less defense for the dollars spent."

It is pretty good proof that, in the name of national defense, any cost is justified, even if it means exorbitant expense to the taxpayer. A close look at the figures revealed by Sen. Proxmire is in order, to say the least. In fact, it is no less than imperative for the Senate to study, line-by-line, these costs, their cause and cure.

#### ASMT PROVIDES VALUABLE SERVICE

#### HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, "Pro Bono Publico"—for the good of the public—is a most apt description of the services rendered by those engaged in the practice of medical technology. Therefore, it is appropriate that this theme should be selected for the American Society for Medical Technology's 42d year of professional activity to be commemorated at its annual meeting in New Orleans, June 23-28.

The American Society for Medical Technology—ASMT—the only national professional organization located in Bellaire, a suburb of Houston, Tex., has over 20,000 members engaged in the practice of clinical laboratory science.

ASMT is dedicated to establishing the highest standards of clinical laboratory methods and research; creating mutual understanding and cooperation between laboratory professionals and other health professionals working in the interests of individual and public health; promoting programs of continuing education; research and development; and advancing the ideals and principles of the medical technology profession.

The laboratory professional of today is an important member of the health care team. The time has passed when his findings were routinely reported to the physician, and increasingly the laboratory professional is expected to understand the clinical significance of his findings and correlate them with other sections of the laboratory. In short, many laboratory professionals are rapidly moving away from the benchworker concept of yesterday and actively participating in decision and policymaking within the clinical laboratory.

Clinical laboratory science has expanded tremendously during the last few years, and the number of clinical laboratory tests and resultant findings will greatly increase during the coming decade. Today's laboratory professionals hold the key to quality performance in the modern clinical laboratory. They must be prepared, through both intensive academic education and clinical training, to carry out responsibilities which involve the very preservation of human life itself. Additionally, in order to maintain the necessary competence that assures quality patient care, ongoing professional involvement and continuing education are vital.

With a broad background in basic science the laboratory professional must be fully prepared to carry out sophisticated laboratory procedures which involve microbiology, chemistry, serology, hematology, and parasitology. The age of automation has brought to the clinical laboratory both speed and precision which were unheard of just a few short years ago. To the laboratory professional, the advent of automation in the laboratory has required the learning of new skills involving sophisticated instrumentation, including the use of computers. Because modern laboratory professionals may work in any number of different laboratory settings, ranging from a hospital or public health laboratory to a pharmaceutical company, they are always at the center of the problem and fully prepared to contribute to its resolution.

As ASMT members participate in their annual meeting, it is well to recall that the strength of any profession rests with individual members who become astute and active participants in the development of professional standards and practice "Pro Bono Publico."

#### FAIRNESS FOR THE CONSUMER

#### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post, in an editorial June 6,

1974, criticized the business community's inability to reconcile its actions with its words in relation to consumerism.

Agreeing with Esther Peterson of Giant Foods, who stated that "business has failed to realize that consumerism can be used effectively as a marketing tool," the editors were specifically dismayed by the extensive lobbying conducted by businesses against the proposed consumer protection agency. They declared that the time has come for trade associations, corporations and others in the business world to recognize that the proposed agency "will not be giving the consumer a club to hit business with, but rather a voice to protest and seek an end to whatever shoddiness, deceptions or injuries he has been inflicted with."

The need for fairness in the marketplace is clearly expressed in this editorial and I commend it to all our colleagues. The editorial follows:

#### FAIRNESS FOR THE CONSUMER

Barring a presidential veto or a filibuster, it now appears as if the five year legislative struggle on behalf of the proposed consumer protection agency will soon be ended. The Senate Government Operations Committee recently approved a version of the bill by a vote of 9 to 3, and earlier it passed the House by 293 to 94. The general purpose of the consumer protection agency would be to act as the consumer advocate before other federal agencies. It would have no direct regulatory powers over industry. In effect, the agency would be a way of achieving the kind of fairness that has long been absent from the marketplace and that parts of the business community have been unwilling to assert voluntarily. The agency will not be giving the consumer a club to hit business with, but rather a voice to protest and seek an end to whatever shoddiness, deceptions or injuries he has been inflicted with.

What is noteworthy about this legislation—aside from the strong congressional support it enjoys—is the continued opposition from a number of business lobbies. Several trade associations, as well as corporations, see the agency as one more horror that beleaguered businessmen must endure. Such an attitude is not new, but in light of recent pro-consumer statements from the heart of the business community itself it takes on a new layer of stubbornness. In the current Harvard Business Review, for example, Esther Peterson of Giant Foods writes in "Consumerism as a Retailer's Asset": "Since the emergence of the present-day form of public advocacy that we know as 'consumerism,' the business community has tended to regard it as an irritant. But my experience in the White House and on Capitol Hill showed me that business has failed to realize that consumerism can be used effectively as a marketing tool." Mrs. Peterson goes on to say that during the first full year of Giant's consumer program the company set records in both sales and earnings and that "the impact of the new consumer program is thought to have played a substantial part in achieving those results."

The point Mr. Peterson makes is not that businessmen should suddenly turn pro-consumer because such a stance will be a profit-making gimmick—the substance of a commitment must be present also, as Giant has shown in many areas—but that disaster does not automatically befall a company that seeks to level with consumers. This was much the thought last September when Edward B. Rust, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, said in a speech that Ralph Nader and his style of consumerism were not the enemy. "If we look at the record, I think we will see a clean community of interest that

Nader has with American business. The whole point of Nader—so obvious that it is often overlooked—in his single-minded dedication to making the free-enterprise system work as it's supposed to—to make marketplace realities of the very virtues that businessmen ascribe to the system."

Lobbying against the proposed consumer protection agency will no doubt persist until final enactment. But it is a lobbying effort that no longer moves with a solid front. Too many voices of reason—such as that of Esther Peterson, who strongly supports the bill even though her own company has reservations about it—are speaking out to explain that marketplace fairness should not be feared but embraced.

#### SANDMAN TO OPPOSE BAN ON NONRETURNS

**HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to emphasize my vehement opposition to proposed legislation that would ban interstate shipment of nonreturnable beverage containers, require a deposit on all bottles and canned beverages, and outlaw the sale of cans with detachable openers.

Specifically, I refer to S. 2062, a measure introduced in the other House of Congress by the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD). Hearings were held recently before the Senate Commerce Subcommittee on Environment.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we can all agree that the goal of eliminating litter and pollution is a desirable one. I do not like to see cans and bottles and other refuse strewn along highways and dumped in our rivers and waterways any more than anyone else.

But the problem is not with the nonreturnable products, it is with the people who litter them. The real solution to litter is education, and stricter enforcement of antilitter laws.

Sure, litter is a problem. But so is arson. Nobody suggests that the solution to the arson problem is to ban matches.

One of the biggest single items of litter along America's streets and highways is the newspaper, but nobody is suggesting that we pass a law to require a 10-cent deposit on every newspaper.

The fuzzy thinking behind this bill (S. 2062) is the same as was in evidence in 1972 when a similar measure appeared in the New Jersey Legislature. I led the opposition to that measure as public hearings at the State capitol in Trenton. The bill was defeated.

My interest in this legislation, I must admit, is more than ordinary, since my congressional district is the location of some of the major glass products industries in the Nation.

The nonreturnable bottle accounts for a tremendous amount of employment in southern New Jersey, so the Hatfield bill would have a disastrous effect on my district.

But more than that, Mr. Speaker, this bill approaches the litter problem from the wrong end. Let us enforce laws against littering, not ban the things that are littered.

Let us build on the excellent progress being made in the field of recycling and reuse of glass products.

My purpose today is simply to alert the promoters of this type of "ban the bottle" thinking that even if the measure referred to passes the other body, it faces the toughest opposition here in the House of Representatives where I, for one, am determined it will never pass.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE TO BE COMMENDED BUT MORE PROTECTION NEEDED FOR LOUISIANA AND MISSISSIPPI RIVER VALLEY

**HON. LINDY BOGGS**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to commend the Public Works Committee for their diligent efforts in formulating the fiscal 1975 appropriations bill that was so overwhelmingly supported by the full House on June 6. I think the highly favorable vote reflects the desire of Congress to assume an active role in providing needed services for the people of our country, while also helping to bolster the economy of the Nation.

In particular, I would like to single out those sections of the bill pertaining to Mississippi River flood control projects and activities. As indicated by the committee report, an estimated \$15 billion in flood damages have recently been averted due to projects completed by the Army Corps of Engineers in the Mississippi Valley. Numbers alone, however, will never reflect the importance of these projects to area residents.

At this time, I would like to request that an additional recommendation be made by the Public Works Committee in order to better protect and serve the Louisiana and Mississippi River Valley. As the committee report suggests, the committee will reconsider its decision to maintain a moratorium previously imposed upon the modification and upgrading of "hopper" dredges upon completion of a dredge study currently in progress. I hope that the moratorium can be lifted as expeditiously as possible. This machinery is urgently needed today by the Corps of Engineers if the waterways of the Mississippi River are to be maintained.

As we all know, we, at the very mouth of the river, have the problem of taking care of the water and silt that comes down the Mississippi from the heart of America but, without the proper facilities, we cannot meet our responsibilities. To heighten the difficulty, unusually severe flood levels and other environmental conditions have been such that, unless more thorough dredging can be accomplished, large oceangoing vessels

will be prevented from traveling the estuaries leading to the ports upstream and, therefore, resulting in a serious financial loss to our economy.

Explicitly, to begin with, there have been no improvements made to the Army Corps of Engineers fleet of 16 oceangoing hopper dredges since a congressional constraint was imposed on the acquisition and modernization of such equipment in 1968. This situation, in turn, has had a serious impact on shipping and trading, both in my home area and nationwide. "Southwest" and "South" Passes are the gateways to the Ports of New Orleans and Baton Rouge, the Nation's No. 2 and No. 4 ports, respectively, and both ports are entirely dependent upon timely and adequate dredging of these passes to provide access to the gulf. However, in only 1 year, 1972, out of the past 5, has full project depth been maintained by the Corps of Engineers at Southwest Pass for the entire high-water season. In other years, the ports upstream depended upon dredging activity to insure vessel passage. Statistics indicate, however, that they were not always successful.

During the period of restricted channel depth in 1973, for instance, a study was made of 46 grain-carrying vessels which were capable of loading to 40 feet or more, but were limited by pass conditions. This study revealed that, as a result, approximately 470,000 tons of grain were shortloaded—470,000 tons that were detained from the world market and valued at some \$82 million.

These figures indicate that the shoaling difficulty at the mouth of the Mississippi is not simply a local problem with local ramifications. Indeed, it is a problem whose deleterious effects reach around the world when you consider these facts about the Port of New Orleans; it is the No. 1 grain export port in the world, thereby handling some 40 percent of the Nation's grain; it is the No. 2 port in the United States; and the No. 3 port in the world with a value of foreign commerce totaling over \$5 billion a year.

It should also be noted that the ratio of exports to imports for foreign trade at the Port of New Orleans is 1½ to 1, thereby providing a boost to the Nation's balance of payments.

However, if the hopper dredge construction moratorium is not lifted immediately, and the Army Corps of Engineers is not allowed modern and efficient hopper dredges in the afflicted areas, the Ports of New Orleans and Baton Rouge will no longer be able to maintain their current levels of activity. In turn, the U.S. position in world commerce will be adversely affected.

In light of the foregoing, it is my fervent hope that the comprehensive dredge study report can be expedited and the moratorium restricting the upgrading and modernization of hopper dredges lifted as soon as possible. The continued vitality of two of our country's major ports, as well as the economy of both the State of Louisiana and the Nation, depends upon such action.

## DESEGREGATION ENDANGERED

## HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 5, in an act of political appeasement, the House instructed its conferees to defend the language of the Esch amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I deplore this action, for I believe the amendment is unconstitutional. Certainly, if enacted, it will encourage defiance of the Constitution.

Schools must be desegregated, and busing is a means to that constitutionally mandated end. I regret that many politicians, including the President of the United States, have chosen to manipulate public feeling on the misunderstood busing issue. For busing is not the issue, except insofar as the opponents of desegregation make it the battleground.

I am determined to fight for integration. Many of the opponents of busing are opponents of true racial and educational equality. But for those of my colleagues who support antibusing measures for purely political reasons, or because they mistakenly believe that a majority of blacks, teachers, or concerned educators oppose busing to achieve desegregation, I would like to call their attention to the following letter from the June 5 Washington Post. It indicates that a significant sector of the educational community believes busing is necessary to achieve the constitutionally defined goal of equal education for all American citizens:

## ANTIBUSING AMENDMENTS

As the executive secretaries of the American Association of School Administrators, comprising 21,000 of the nation's school administrators, and the Counsel of Chief State School Officers, the state superintendents and commissioners of education, we believe that the anti-busing amendments to the pending House-Senate elementary and secondary education legislation interfere with state constitutional responsibilities and local control of schools. We urge the conferees to adopt the more moderate Senate version.

One House provision, the Esch Amendment, would make the maintenance of an undefined "neighborhood school" national policy, thus interfering with local control and hampering the efforts of almost every state to establish school districts and for modern programs. Local school officials require flexibility in the assignment and transportation of students to schools of different types to maximize opportunity. Specialized curriculum programs and equalization of community support for school facilities across neighborhood lines has historically required reassignment and transportation of pupils; more than 40% of all U.S. public school children ride buses daily. The amendment's encouragement for the reopening of desegregation court orders would create chaos in thousands of districts which have completed a painful process of desegregation in accordance with national policy.

We also believe that this amendment would subvert the existing policy of the United States to desegregate schools by (1) trying to limit desegregation action by the legalistic use of the terms "dual school systems" and "unitary school systems," and (2) placing additional burden of proof on school

officials by requiring evidence that children are "excluded" from any school because of race (effectively legitimizing voluntary open enrollment policies as desegregation.)

The House bill also contains an Ashbrook Amendment, prohibiting use of any federal funds for busing for desegregation. This would further hamper state and local school administration by preventing localities from voluntarily requesting federal Emergency School Aid funds for this purpose.

The Senate bill does not contain the court-order-reopening and the "exclusion" provisions, and includes a disclaimer recognizing the authority of U.S. Courts to enforce the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution. While we regret that the Senate adopted any additional anti-busing amendments, these are at least explicitly designed to allow states and local school districts recourse to Constitutional remedies.

State and local school officials would be unduly hampered in their ability to provide equal educational opportunity under the House anti-busing provisions, and we urge the Conferees to adopt the more moderate Senate language.

BYRON W. HANSFORD,  
Executive Secretary, Council of Chief  
State School Officers.

PAUL B. SALMON,  
Executive Secretary, American Association  
of School Administrators.

OUR BELEAGUERED CHESAPEAKE  
BAY—PART I

## HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to spend nearly all of my life in the Chesapeake Bay country, and today I am proud to represent a congressional district which contains the greater share of the bay itself. I have expressed concern, as many have, over the future of the bay and the many threats posed to it by both man and nature and earlier I introduced House Joint Resolution 979 to create an interstate compact to deal with these problems, together with 16 cosponsors from Maryland, Virginia, and Delaware.

But it is not always easy to create a general awareness of the need for such action, and thus I was pleased to see an excellent four-part series on the bay and its problems published last week in the Washington Star-News, authored by staff writer Woody West.

Today, I offer for the RECORD part I of this series, in which Mr. West details some of the man-made problems which plague the bay. He notes that "the bay today is, by and large, a healthy body." But he goes on to quote several prominent scientists from Maryland and Virginia as believing that "the demands which an elbow-to-elbow urban mass is making upon parts of the bay and its tributaries are creating dangerous pressures."

I commend Mr. West's detailed recitation of threats to the bay's health to the Members of this House, and hope that it will help inspire prompt action by the Judiciary Committee in the near future on House Joint Resolution 979 which I

have introduced to deal with the situation.

Part I follows:

THE BAY BEGINS TO FEEL MAN'S PRESSURES  
(By Woody West)

(NOTE.—This is the first of a four-part series on the Chesapeake Bay, the forces which threaten it and its future relative to the millions of people in this area who depend upon it for work and pleasure. Today: The mounting human and natural pressures on the Bay.)

"Heaven and earth never agreed better to frame a place for man's habitation," wrote Capt. John Smith after his explorations of the Chesapeake Bay in 1607 and 1608.

"Here are mountains, hills, plains, valleys, rivers and brookes, all running most pleasantly into a faire Bay," wrote Smith, "compassed but for the mouth, with fruitful and delightful land."

More than 350 years after Capt. Smith and his few companions pushed out from Jamestown to learn what they could of this entrancing new land, his description yet applies.

It is a "faire Bay" and a "delightful land," though the millions who followed Smith have gouged and fashioned the land and water to their own purposes, as to those of us—more than 8 million people—who have settled around the Bay and along its twisting tributaries.

The Chesapeake and its land have, in the main, tolerated man's intrusions and perturbations. Even more, the Bay has lent itself to man's diverse purposes and visions.

But it cannot continue to do so indefinitely. The Chesapeake Bay is not a fragile system, but it is sensitive.

It is time now—critically so, say those who study the Bay and its awesome sweep—for the decisions to be made that will determine how this massive resource will be used—or abused—in future decades.

Dr. L. Eugene Cronin, director of the University of Maryland's Natural Resources Institute and a leading scientist in Bay affairs, in an interview called the Chesapeake the "crown jewel" of estuaries.

He and other prominent scientists are in agreement that the Bay today is, by and large, a healthy body. But it is increasingly apparent, they emphasize, that the demands which an elbow-to-elbow urban mass is making upon parts of the Bay and its tributaries are creating dangerous pressures.

These, if unchecked, sloppily managed or ill understood, have the potential to inflict major environmental damage on the Chesapeake and its well watered lands.

"These are sick spots, indications of trouble for the future," said Cronin, "but the Bay is very productive, still enormously valuable for all its principal users. All of it, in general, is in good shape today."

Dr. Donald W. Pritchard, for a quarter of a century the director of the respected Johns Hopkins University's Chesapeake Bay Institute, concurs. "Man's impact so far has been on the peripheral reaches of the Bay for the most part," he said. "The affected areas are small compared to the large expanses of the Bay."

Dr. William J. Hargis Jr., director of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science in Gloucester, observed, "The Bay proper, from Annapolis down, is not in bad shape and, even above, it's still in fairly recent shape. But there are significant problems in certain areas. The tributaries are in the worst condition."

Cronin, Pritchard and Hargis, considered to be among the most knowledgeable scientists and observers of the Bay, are not sanguine. There must be better management, based on more precise scientific data, and it must be put to work by those with responsibilities for controlling the widely diverse uses. And both these functions must be supported

by a public concern far more sophisticated than at present.

"Science and management," said Hargis, "are not keeping pace with the increase in pressures. Management is not supported adequately and just isn't able to respond to changing needs."

An intense man now in his 11th year as head of the Marine Science Institute, Hargis, like his colleagues, foresees a brighter chance for the Bay.

"There is more specific information about the Bay than ever before," he said. "There is probably more scientific effort under way than on any comparable body of water."

But Hargis wonders about what sort of headway he and his colleagues are making. "We're farther upstream than we were," he said, "but we aren't gaining."

Both man and nature make formidable demands on the Chesapeake and its tributaries. It is a relationship of intricate interdependence, one far from fully understood. What is known, however, is that each benefit poses a compensatory difficulty.

Each day, 1,260 million gallons of water are taken from the system to provide a huge daily gulp of some 100 gallons per person.

The disposal of domestic wastes—by consensus, the most critical problem in the Bay area—requires extraordinary investment for treatment facilities that even in their technology produce changes that can affect the biota—the body of plant and animal life.

It takes no special alertness to see, and to smell, the noxious mats of blue-green algae that spread dismally across portions of the Potomac River and other Upper Bay tributaries during the blistering months of summer. The exotic aquatic growths are abetted in their unnatural proliferation by high concentrations of nutrients in effluent.

The algae, in insidious progression, can smother other forms of life by monopolizing the supply of oxygen, leading, in extreme cases, to fish kills, for example. High bacterial counts, from inefficiently treated wastes, can have devastating effects on the harvest of shellfish. Thousands of acres in the bay tributaries now are barred for oyster and clam harvests.

Sedimentation illustrates a natural pressure that is heightened by man's activities. The runoff from the land is a wholly natural phenomenon, surface matter carried by rains and by winds to the water. Indeed, say geologists, even though men had never perched along the Bay, sedimentation and siltation from runoff would, in a matter of some centuries, have filled in the Chesapeake.

But man, bravely raising his proud structures with beaver energy, vastly aggravates the process. The Maryland Department of Natural Resources estimates that forested lands lose up to 100 tons of sediment per square mile each year. It is not uncommon the agency goes on, for a typical suburban construction site to contribute as much as 200 tons of silt per year.

There are two results: Streams and inlets are constricted, often blocked. Witness Bladensburg and Port Tobacco in Maryland, which, in colonial years, were bustling seaports. Today, their channels, filled with silt from lands hardly disturbed by man two centuries ago, are barely ports for small pleasure boats.

In addition, the runoff now includes baleful materials—pesticides from agricultural methods that have significantly increased yields per acre but that in concentration can be toxic to the environment. And the runoff from storm drainage in urban areas carries varieties of other chemicals and such high-bacteria elements as animal feces.

Add another complication: Seaborne commerce on the Bay, with the ports of Baltimore and Norfolk accounting for the bulk, is worth well over \$100 million a year in

iron and coal, petroleum and manufactured goods.

Clogging of shipping channels and of marinas must be combatted constantly if commerce is to be maintained at its high levels. What then is to be done with the spoilage and debris from dredging, containing as it does concentrations of heavy metals—copper and lead, zinc and mercury?

For years, much of the dredged waste was dumped promiscuously in nearby tidal areas—the vital wetlands. There, it would destroy the essential nursery and spawning areas for many species of fish and shellfish and destroy the vegetation that is a key link in the Bay's food chain.

Interest conflicts with interest, use with use.

Choices must be made, choices which will invariably infringe on others, each of which will be considered as the most necessary by one group or another.

There is a human tendency to look at a phenomenon as imposing as the Chesapeake Bay with a pinched perspective, reflecting the narrow vision of each individual's special interest.

To the boater, the Chesapeake represents one of the finest cruising grounds in this country. To the waterman, the Bay is a bountiful, if often perverse, treasure, supporting the second largest fishing industry in the country. To the suburban dweller, it is an opportunity to stretch his concrete-cramped soul.

To the industrialist, it is a highway of matchless convenience and strategic location, and to the sports fisherman—a booming popular species, spawned by the increase in leisure and the growth of affluence the Chesapeake is a bonanza of striped bass and perch and bluefish, croaker and spot and flounder. To the developer, it is sites for waterfront villages and second-home communities.

These limited, if understandable, perspectives will not in insulation lend themselves to careful management of the Bay—on this there is unanimous agreement among scientists, conservationists, administrators, and specialists who seldom can find unanimity. Dr. Frank S. L. Williamson, director of the Smithsonian Institution's Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies in Edgewater, Md., gives a graphic possibility if the irrational overwhelms the reasoned.

"It's conceivable," he said, "that over the years the Bay could be reduced to a mono culture but still be as good as a major ship channel and a sink for wastes as it is now. And it might look as charming as it now does."

"People still haven't recognized that there's such a thing as a non-renewable resource."

#### AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 10294

**HON. JAMES G. MARTIN**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 10294, the Land Use Planning Act of 1974, is considered by the House of Representatives, I will offer a series of five amendments to strengthen the role of local governments in the planning and decisionmaking process.

The amendments are supported by the national associations of local governments; the National League of Cities-U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National

Association of Counties, and the National Association of Regional Councils. They are printed below, along with explanations.

In addition, there will be offered an amendment seeking to strike section 108(d)(2) which could be read as authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to impose on a State a Federal determination that an area is one of critical environmental concern of more than statewide significance.

The "local government amendments" are as follows:

#### AMENDMENT No. 1

Page 27, after line 2, add the following new subsection (c):

"The authority to manage and regulate the use of non-Federal land rests with the several states and their political subdivisions, and that general purpose local governments should continue to have the responsibility for land use decisions which have no significant effect outside their jurisdictions."

#### EXPLANATION

To clarify the Congress' findings that this bill does not require nor encourage federal zoning or land use on non-federal lands, and further that general purpose local governments should continue to make land use decisions that have no significant effect outside their jurisdictions. This is consistent with the premise of the legislation that all land uses are presumed to be of local significance unless explicitly determined, through the land use planning process, to be of more than local significance; in other words, all land uses are excluded unless specifically included.

This amendment is a new Sec. 101(c). It goes to both the issue of federal control and state-local government relations.

#### AMENDMENT No. 2

Section 106(b), page 37, line 25, insert before the word "states" the following sentence:

"The allocation of responsibility between the state government and its political subdivisions for the development and implementation of the state land use planning process shall be determined by state law."

#### EXPLANATION

Since it is assumed that in most if not all cases it will require state legislation to implement this Act, this sentence clarifies the fact that each state, through its legislature, will decide what balance will be struck with local government. The remaining language of 106(b) encourages states to utilize general purpose local governments to implement.

#### AMENDMENT No. 3

Page 39, line 20, delete "or".

Page 40, line 2, delete the ", and" and insert "; or" and add the following new paragraph: "(5) require or encourage States to intercede in land use decisions of purely local concern."

#### EXPLANATION

This amendment would make explicit that nothing in title I, Assistance to States, requires or encourages the states to review all land use decisions nor intercede in local government land use actions that are of purely local concern. This amendment reiterates that the purpose of the bill is to affect only those land uses and critical areas of more than local significance.

This amendment has been incorporated in Sec. 105(d).

#### AMENDMENT No. 4

Page 92 after line 17, add a new subsection (g) to Sec. 411:

"(g) as preventing or delaying any State or local government from receiving any federal financial assistance to which it otherwise would be entitled prior to a finding, pursuant to Section 108 of this Act, that the State has established and is implementing a comprehensive land use planning process."

## EXPLANATION

This amendment would make explicit that nothing in the act shall be construed to prevent or delay a state or local government from continuing to receive federal funding pending the completion of the land use planning process. A state has three years in which to establish and administer a comprehensive land use planning process, during which time the normal governmental process should not grind to a halt. Neither a federal agency or a state should use the incomplete land use planning process as an excuse to impede otherwise eligible projects.

## AMENDMENT No. 5

Page 94, lines 14-19, strike out lines 14 through 19 inclusive and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) The term 'general purpose local government' means any general unit of local government as defined by the Bureau of the Census."

## EXPLANATION

The primary purpose of this amendment would be to bring the definition of "general purpose local government" into conformity with the terms used by the Bureau of the Census, the Office of Revenue Sharing, and the OMB Circular A-95. The definition used in the bill would cause confusion over a widely used term requiring precise and uniform definition.

The Bureau of the Census classified local governments by the following five types: Counties, townships, municipalities, special districts and school districts. Of these, only counties, townships, and municipalities are included as "general units of local government."

The term "general purpose local government" is used for identifying implementation authority (shared with the State) for eligibility on the Intergovernmental Advisory Council. These are basic governmental functions and should be exercised by elected local officials. "Local governments, including general purpose local governments, are provided for throughout the bill, requiring their substantial and meaningful involvement." Furthermore, the State could choose to delegate its implementation authority to a special district or other agency of the State.

## THE FAILURE OF THE NEWS MEDIA

## HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the news media have taken a considerable amount of criticism on the Watergate and related scandals. Most of this has taken the form of self-serving attempts to distract attention by blaming the bearer of evil tidings, and does not deserve serious consideration.

However, as columnist Mary McGrory pointed out in the Washington Star-News of July 2, 1973, there are many occasions when the press simply does not do its job, when famous and eminent reporters are more concerned with being

on comfortable terms with power than with serving truth. Ms. McGrory suggests the reason the now-famous team of Woodward and Bernstein were so successful is that, at the time they did their serious work, they were nobodies. They had not experienced the pleasures of association with the powerful; therefore, they felt no need to avoid ruffling feathers. Where more eminent reporters would have accepted comfortable evasions to comfortable questions, Woodward and Bernstein persisted—and found answers that astonished everyone, including themselves.

I suggest there is a lesson for the Congress as well as for the press here: a question deserves a straight answer. If we do not get one from an administration official, we can presume he is hiding something, and if we let him get away with it, we are not doing our job.

I insert Ms. McGrory's column, titled "Don't Be Nice to Power," in the RECORD at this point:

## DON'T BE NICE TO POWER

(By Mary McGrory)

My favorite passage in "All the President's Men" (Simon & Schuster; \$8.95) by Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward is a little off the theme—which is how a pair of engaging young Washington Post reporters, who didn't know their place, uncovered a president.

It is an account of Woodward's encounter, by phone, with Henry Kissinger and it illustrates as well as anything else why they got the Watergate story while older, presumably wiser, heads flunked out.

Armed with information from the FBI that Kissinger, then in the White House, had personally authorized several wiretaps, Woodward simply asked him.

"I don't believe that it was true," Kissinger replied guardedly.

"Almost never," he said a sentence later. Woodward pointed out that "almost never" could mean "sometime" and inquired if Kissinger was confirming the story.

"I don't have to submit to police interrogation," sputtered the darling of the rest of the Washington press corps.

Did you do it? Woodward asked. When Kissinger discovered that Woodward intended to quote him, Kissinger blew up. "In five years in Washington I've never been trapped into talking like this."

Of course he hadn't. Inevitably, Kissinger called the Post's diplomatic reporter and executive editor to complain bitterly. The story was not run, and the Post the next day was, for once, beaten on a Watergate affair. But the point is not that the Post deferred to Kissinger, because it was lionhearted in its support of its two young tigers. The point is that officials get away with murder because so many reporters would rather call Kissinger "Henry" than find out what he is up to.

Woodward and Bernstein, thank heaven, didn't know the rules. They should not even have been on Watergate, which turned out, thanks to their efforts, to be the political saga of the century. Woodward, 29, was a local reporter, Bernstein, 28, on Virginia politics. But the June 17, 1972, break-in was, at first blush, a police story, and they were hungry—and available.

When John Mitchell quit July 1, Woodward respectfully sought expert counsel. National reporters assured him the resignation was "unconnected with Watergate." But the metropolitan editor, another stranger to the stratosphere, said, "A man like John Mitchell doesn't give up all that power for his wife."

What the two-man Viet Cong did to Richard Nixon is visibly cosmic. They have

wrought almost equal havoc on their trade. They have smashed the comfortable notion of Capital Journalism, with its heavy stress on contacts, confidences and membership in the Gridiron Club. Properly practiced, it's shoeleather, sweat and scramble.

For them it was knocking on doors of frightened Nixon campaign nobodies in the middle of the night, jumping into cabs with crooked lawyers, badgering the FBI.

They had one highly placed source, in the executive branch, a curious cryptic fellow dubbed "Deep Throat." Woodward set great store by him, met him in an underground garage at 3 in the morning. But he sounds like one of their editors. "Go back," he says to the hollow-eyed Woodward. "Dig deeper."

They dug, like day-laborers. The early leads were wispy: A whispered "CIA" from burglar James McCord in a courtroom; an entry in another burglar's notebook about "Whse—Howard Hunt." Woodward tracks him down. "Good God," says Hunt, and they are off.

Bernstein finds a check in a Florida state's attorney office that puts them on the trail of vast caches of tainted political money. The White House lies, denies, fulminates. The reporters make mistakes. They press and guess too hard, play games and write a bummer about H. R. Haldeman. They get desperate—and dirty—and try to quiz grand jury members. But they "hang tough" and when the dam begins to burst and the field gets crowded, they jump out front again with the first story that the prosecutors are sniffing around the Oval Office.

It's a great story, even now suspenseful, lively, fast-paced, and profane. It isn't over, yet, but here we see how it all began. And as Watergate brought us back to the first principles of democracy, "All the President's Men" brings us back to the first principles of journalism: Ask, go back, be nice to people, but not to power.

Even those colleagues most discounted by their feats will have to admit that Woodward and Bernstein have brought back to the "writing press" a full measure of power and glory. It is an honorable calling.

## SAFETY AT SUMMER CAMP

## HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, this week my colleagues on the Select Labor Subcommittee will conclude hearings on youth camp safety. The testimony offered has been informative and at times heart rending; for parents sending their children off to camp this season it has been important.

Witnesses such as Dr. Glenn Haugie and Mrs. Mitchell Kurman, who testified in Bear Mountain, N.Y., last Friday, retold their tragic stories of personal loss once more, in an effort to persuade Congress and the public that there is a very definite need for Federal camp safety regulations. The deaths of their children in camping accidents attest to that need.

As a parent and a concerned member of Congress, I feel strongly that the "Youth Camp Safety Act," H.R. 1486, must be passed this year. The legislation has been the subject of deliberation for 8 years—any further delay would not only be pointless but tragic.

A 1972 HEW survey, which covered

less than a third of the Nation's 10,000-plus camps, revealed 25 deaths, 1,223 serious illnesses, and 1,448 injuries associated with camping that summer. The survey adds that effective data gathering would reveal considerably higher figures. It also revealed that a quarter of a million children are involved in serious camping accidents each season.

Most camps have the hidden capacity for enormous danger, and parents are in no position to monitor safety conditions after they leave their children at camp.

It is of little reassurance to parents that only six States have adequate youth camp safety regulations. The Youth Camp Safety Act would not only help establish effective standards but also provide the States with the financial and technical assistance to see that they are enforced.

The need for this legislation is made abundantly clear in an article in today's New York Times under the headline "Summer Camp Safety: Voices of Concern." The article follows:

SUMMER CAMP SAFETY: VOICES OF CONCERN

(By Richard Flaste)

A year ago Dr. Glenn Haughie, a physician in Rochester, N.Y., sent his 8-year-old son to a summer camp run by a friend of the family. Five days later his son was taken on an overnight hike. While the other campers slept, the boy walked to the edge of a nearby cliff and fell more than 100 feet to his death. The conjecture is that he was sleep-walking.

Now, with another summer camp season just weeks away, and the grief he, his wife and their three surviving children felt still fresh, Dr. Haughie is trying to do something about the kind of accident that killed his son.

He is a public health official in Monroe County and has been conferring with New York State on the efficacy of its camp safety laws, many of which have been in force for only a year or so. And he traveled down to the Bear Mountain Inn on Friday to testify at Congressional field hearings on safety.

The hearings, held by Representative Dominick V. Daniels, Democrat of New Jersey, and Representative Peter A. Peyser, the New York Republican, were part of a series on their bill to encourage the states to set camp safety standards and, where the states fail to do so, to impose Federal regulations. The regulations will be drawn up by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

At the moment, Mr. Daniels says that only six states have comprehensive youth camp safety laws—California, Colorado, Connecticut, Michigan, New York, and New Jersey. Only 26 states have any laws at all specifically affecting camps, he said.

Dr. Haughie's recounting of how his son died was important in that it added to the list of what Mr. Daniels calls "verifiable horror stories" that have convinced him there is a need for standards to govern all of the nation's 10,000 summer camps.

This summer there will be camps with unlicensed drivers who transport children on camp grounds, camps with untrained waterfront personnel, with crowded, hazardous or unsanitary conditions and with counselors who lack camping experience.

However, despite a lack of regulation, the camping industry and others in the field often point out that camps are really not so very dangerous. The figures frequently

quoted are 250,000 annual injuries, many of them minor, and 92 annual fatalities—out of a total number of campers estimated to be as high as 10-million.

Although the percentage of total injuries may be small—and many camps have deservedly high reputations for safety—it is little consolation to Dr. Haughie, who wonders how the camp entrusted with the care of his child could have been so misguided as to use that campsite by the cliff and why his child's counselor wasn't trained better.

He thinks that additional legislation, even if it cannot outlaw all accidents or all ignorance, will at least make camps and counselors more safety conscious.

#### THORN IN INDUSTRY'S SIDE

Another father who lost a son is Mitchell Kurman, a traveling furniture salesman who lives in Westport, Conn. In 1955, as he tells it, his son David, 15 years old, was permitted by his Y.M.C.A. counselor to canoe in a Maine river that was known to be treacherous. His counselor's canoe overturned. So did David's. A boy in David's canoe was pinned against a rock and survived, as did the counselor. But David drowned.

Mr. Kurman has since become a thorn in the camping industry's side, continually telling the story of his boy's death, and of other accidents while calling for Federal legislation.

In fact he was instrumental in getting Mr. Daniels interested in camp safety. Mr. Kurman testified on the Daniels bill in Washington last month, as he has every time the bill has come up for consideration, in 1968, 1969 and 1971. (He missed the Bear Mountain meeting, sending his wife instead because he was in Albany talking about safety on a television show.)

For his testimony this year, Mr. Kurman carried to Washington a letter he had just received from Gary Lack, the other boy in his son's canoe.

Now grown, Mr. Lack writes: "I, Gary Lack, was there with David Kurman when he died. I as a young kid found myself in a canoe shooting down the rapids of a savage river which no local adult would dare to do—and this thanks to the wrong planning, ignorance and carelessness of a public organization. The YMCA afterwards tried to put the blame on the children and accuse us of wrong-doing when we only followed orders."

Six years after David's death, Mr. Kurman received an out-of-court settlement of \$30,000.

Mr. Kurman and the Congressmen sponsoring the Federal bill say there is real hope that it will be passed this year (not, of course, in time for the current season). It was narrowly defeated in 1971, when Congress passed instead a bill that called for a study of camp safety by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

#### STUDY A WASTE OF MONEY

That study was recently completed. To Mr. Daniels, Mr. Peyser and the parents pushing for legislation, it was no more than a delaying tactic accomplished through the power of a camp lobby in the Southwest. It cost \$300,000 and was, in Representative Daniel's words "a waste of the taxpayer's money."

The study came under fire primarily for its methods. It relied heavily on mailed questionnaires, with only limited on-site inspection of camps.

Mr. Peyser was especially displeased with H.E.W.'s interpretation of the study. Although the researchers found that most state legislation was "grossly inadequate," H.E.W. nevertheless recommended that camp safety standards be left to the states and not the Federal Government.

In asserting that there is indeed a need for Federal legislation, Representative Peyser

points to Federal laws that protect wild animals. And Mr. Daniels points to the recent Occupational Safety and Health Act, which orders camps to make working conditions safe for counselors and other employees. They are both dismayed by the fact that while animals and workers are protected, children are not.

Meanwhile, what can a parent do to be reasonably sure that his child is attending a safe camp? Conversations with Government officials, the Kurmans and others lead to the following recommendations.

It makes sense to visit the camp (frequently parents do not, relying on brochures and ads—and Mr. Daniels charges that there is "often a credibility gap between camp literature and the actual facts").

A visit allows a parent to see first-hand, where the swimming area is situated (is it too close to rocky areas or boating lanes?) and whether the camp vehicles and other equipment seem in good repair. It allows an examination of cabins to see if there is potential overcrowding (a rule of thumb is that there should be at least 30 inches between beds and there should be at least two exits in case of fire (an accessible, easily opened window is acceptable as a second exit)).

#### PRECAUTIONS MAY BE LAX

Whether they visit or not, parents should inquire about the qualifications of a camp's staff (generally counselors should be 18 or over—that's law in New York—and waterfront directors should hold advanced Red Cross certificates). It's important to know if a doctor or registered nurse is always on call.

And a parent should determine how safety oriented the camp's director is. Does he speak freely about safety procedures at the camp? Does he keep records of injuries?

Even at well-run camps not all recommended safety precautions are taken. After the hearings the other day, the Congressmen took a quick tour of a camp maintained by the Palisades Interstate Park Commission and observed that the cabins had doors that opened inward—they are supposed to open outward to allow rapid escape during a fire. They also noticed a live electrical wire that extended over a lake near the camp's swimming area.

In both cases, John Rand, a commission official, said he was considering corrective action.

Perhaps one measure of a camp's safety is whether it is accredited by the American Camping Association, which includes nearly half the country's camps and has an extensive safety code. However, the association routinely inspects its camps only once every five years and says it doesn't have the money or manpower to make more frequent investigations.

The State of New York, which has annual inspections, concedes that it, too, is having problems. Howard B. Gates, 3d, a state official, says the state is having "some difficulty in providing adequate number of trained personnel to conduct this program," and expresses the hope that Federal activity might help provide the people to enforce the regulations.

But will the Federal Government do any better? Mr. Daniels, as he sat down to a hurried lunch with his staff and others interested in the legislation, was complaining about poor enforcement of the occupational safety act. Pressed on whether he thought a camp safety law would fare any better, he was equivocal.

But to Mitchell Kurman, even if the regulations aren't enforced, they would represent an improvement. At least there would be "something," he said. "Right now there's anarchy."

## THE BUDGET BILL

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it has taken months and months of urging, discussion, research, debate, and compromise, but the Congress is now nearing one of the most important steps it can take even in these crisis-charged times. I am speaking of the conference approval of the proposed budget reform and impoundment control bill.

On July 26, 1972, I was joined by several colleagues in a special order concerning our budget and impoundment problems. The debate has continued virtually unabated ever since. The debate, importantly, has not centered on whether the Congress did not have sufficient control over the Federal budget but rather on how Congress could establish control over the budget.

The conference bill follows no one person's or group's blueprint exactly, but it shows well the marks of the many who have labored with this issue. I hope that we will be able to see this measure through to a speedy and overwhelming conclusion—and get the congressional budget reins in operation before the year is out.

I would like to reprint the two articles which appeared in the Washington Post a few days ago concerning the conference bill.

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 1974]

## CONFEREES AGREE ON BUDGET BILL

(By Spencer Rich)

A compromise bill laying out a revolutionary new congressional procedure for handling the government's \$304 billion annual budget has been drafted for final consideration by a House-Senate conference committee.

The budget bill is aimed at recapturing the power of the purse from the White House by giving Congress, for the first time, a mechanism to consider the entire federal budget as a whole. For lack of such a mechanism, sponsors of the bill contend, Congress has in practice lost control to the White House Office of Management and Budget.

The initial House version was passed 386 to 23 Dec. 5. The Senate followed March 22 with its own version, 80 to 0. For the last three months—under the close supervision of key conferees like Reps. Richard Bolling (D-Mo.) and Dave Martin (R-Neb.) and Sens. Sam J. Ervin Jr. (D-N.C.), Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine) and Charles H. Percy (R-Ill.)—staff aides have been drafting a compromise. It includes language, put together yesterday to curb presidential impoundment of funds appropriated by Congress.

The compromise creates separate budget committees in the House and the Senate to look over all proposals for federal spending, to fix an overall target federal surplus or deficit, to set a ceiling on federal outlays as a whole and to assign program priorities by dividing the total among 14 broad categories such as defense, health and agriculture.

The bill would move the start of the fiscal year from July 1 to Oct. 1, giving Congress three extra months to complete action on all authorizations and appropriations, as well as overall spending ceilings. A congressional budget office with its own staff would pro-

vide technical expertise for the new budget committees.

The budget committee in each chamber would report a concurrent resolution by April 15 setting out target spending figures for the government as a whole and for each of the 14 major categories.

These would have to be passed in both chambers and cleared through conference by May 15. The figures in this initial target resolution would then serve as a guide for passage of appropriations bills during the rest of the spring and summer.

On Sept. 15, another concurrent resolution would adjust the overall totals and 14 program ceilings in accord with developments in the economy since May 15. If the individual appropriations bills total more than the second concurrent resolution, Congress would have to pass, by Sept. 25, a "reconciliation bill" making any cutbacks needed to comply with the target figures in the Sept. 15 concurrent resolution.

In effect, Congress would set out broad budget totals and priorities twice a season (May 15 and Sept. 15) and then in the final "reconciliation bill" would make sure that these targets were complied with.

In the House, the budget committee would consist of five members from the Appropriations Committee, five from Ways and Means, 11 from other standing committees and one each from the Democratic and Republican leadership. In the Senate, the committee would have 15 members.

The compromise bill further provides that if the President wants to impound appropriated funds for policy reasons, he must obtain congressional permission by means of a rescission (cutback) bill. However, if he wants merely to delay an outlay, or to hold it up for technical rather than broad policy reasons, he simply has to notify Congress. Unless one or the other chamber vetoes his plan, he can go ahead.

The new congressional budget office would be something like a miniature OMB, with its own nonpartisan director appointed for four years by House and Senate leaders, and removable by either chamber.

The new budget procedure is one of the keystones of the congressional effort to reclaim powers that critics say have been surrendered to the White House through congressional sloth and disorganization. They say that Congress, lacking any mechanism for controlling the budget as a whole, has consistently passed individual spending bills whose total far exceeds amounts dictated by economic prudence, with disastrous inflationary effects.

This has made it necessary for the President, who has a large bureaucracy to help him, to make the hard decisions on which programs to cut or abolish to avert economic damage; Congress then complains that the President is "usurping" the power of the purse.

[From the Washington Post, June 6, 1974]

## CONFEREES AGREE ON BUDGET PLAN

(By Spencer Rich)

House-Senate conferees agreed without dissent yesterday on a compromise bill establishing a revolutionary congressional procedure for handling the government's budget.

Aimed at recapturing the power of the purse from the White House, the bill creates a system for Congress to consider the federal budget as a whole. Lacking any such system, the legislative branch has allowed the White House to make virtually all key budgetary decisions in recent years, proponents of the new procedure say.

The measure, which also includes provisions to curb presidential impoundment of funds voted by Congress, is considered one of the most important in the drive to re-

assert congressional powers against alleged "presidential usurpation." The compromise bill now goes back to the House and the Senate for routine final approval before being sent to the White House.

For the first time, budget committees in the House and the Senate would look over all proposals for federal spending, fix an overall target federal surplus or deficit figure, set a ceiling on federal outlays as a whole, and divide up the overall spending total among 14 broad categories like defense, natural resources, health and agriculture.

By May 15 each year Congress would have to complete action on an initial concurrent resolution setting out the target spending figures. During the rest of the spring and summer, the appropriations committees would report out spending bills for individual federal departments. By Sept. 15, Congress would pass a second concurrent resolution adjusting overall spending targets in accord with economic and policy developments since May 15.

If the amounts in the individual appropriations bills added up to more than the totals in the Sept. 15 concurrent resolution, then Congress by Sept. 25 would have to pass a "reconciliation bill" making cutbacks to stay within the Sept. 15 guidelines.

## SOME HARD TRUTHS ABOUT THE VIETNAM WAR

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there are many Americans, and many in the Congress, who tell us that the Vietnam war is over and that American aid and assistance to the government in Saigon should come to an end.

The war, however, is not considered to be over by the North Vietnamese or by their allies in the Soviet Union and Communist China.

Discussing the illusions under which many in Washington seem to be operating, Philip C. Clarke, in his Washington Report of the Air for the American Security Council, notes that—

The world is being treated these days to a strange, Alice-in-Wonderland like spectacle. As the U.S. Congress is busy slashing away at aid to embattled South Vietnam, Soviet and Chinese leaders are assuring Communist North Vietnam of greater than ever support for their objective of total conquest in Indochina.

How tragic it would be if those thousands of young Americans who died fighting Communist aggression in Vietnam have died in vain, a situation which would surely be the case were we to abandon the South Vietnamese to the Communist takeover which the aggressors were unable to achieve in the field of battle.

In a telegram to Secretary of State Kissinger, Ambassador Graham Martin, the distinguished U.S. envoy in Saigon, warned of a decision taken last fall in Hanoi to mount an all-out campaign this winter and spring to persuade the Congress to drastically reduce the magnitude of both economic and military aid to the Government of South Vietnam.

### Mr. Clarke declares that—

As Congress votes to cut deeper and deeper into U.S. aid for South Vietnam one can almost hear the Communists cheering. It is as if the U.S. Congress is following Hanoi's script to the letter.

I wish to share with my colleagues the texts of two recent radio broadcasts by Philip C. Clarke, one with Ambassador Elbridge Durbrow (retired), which were broadcast April 12, 1974 and April 18, 1974, and insert them into the RECORD at this time:

#### VIETNAM: NEW RETREAT

The world is being treated these days to a strange, Alice-in-Wonderland-like spectacle. As the U.S. Congress is busy slashing away at aid to embattled South Vietnam, Soviet and Chinese leaders are assuring Communist North Vietnam of greater than ever support for their objective of total conquest in Indonesia. As some U.S. Senators call for the total abandonment of Saigon, Cuba's Fidel Castro wines and dines the visiting Premier of North Vietnam, Pham Van Dong, and dispatches another 351 Cuban construction workers to Hanoi to help rebuild that Communist ally. And as two of the most influential newspapers in the U.S., the *New York Times* and *Washington Post*, furiously denounce the U.S. Ambassador to Saigon, Graham Martin, for his outspoken defense of U.S. commitments to South Vietnam, the celebrated American actress-activist, Jane Fonda, and her equally activist husband, Tom Hayden, are toasted in Hanoi as they prepare to do a motion picture extolling the virtues of that Communist society. Amid such reversed values, one can be excused for wondering: What goes on here? It is particularly hard to understand how the Congress of the United States, despite its preoccupation with Watergate, the economy and the fuel shortage, can so soon forget the heavy investment this country has made in the freedom and independence of South Vietnam—namely 55,000 American lives and 130 billion dollars. Nor is it easy to comprehend how responsible American political leaders, much less the media, can so easily ignore the reality of what our abandonment of South Vietnam would mean, namely, a Communist takeover and enslavement of 19 million people who have placed their trust in the U.S. and the ensuing Communist conquest of all remaining free nations in strategic Southeast Asia.

In a recent telegram to Secretary of State Kissinger, Ambassador Martin warned of a decision taken last fall in Hanoi to mount an all-out campaign this winter and spring to persuade the Congress to drastically reduce the magnitude of both economic and military aid to the government of South Vietnam. The Ambassador said that the Communists' so-called Provisional Revolutionary Government in Paris was to be the principal channel, using remnants of the American "peace movement" to bring influence to bear on selective, susceptible, but influential elements of the American communications media, and, particularly, on susceptible Congressional staffers. As Congress votes to cut deeper and deeper into U.S. aid for South Vietnam, one can hear the Communists cheering. It is as if the U.S. Congress is following Hanoi's script to the letter. All thoughtful Americans, especially the more than two and a half million who served with the armed forces in Vietnam, should demand of Congress a full explanation of its retreat from responsibility—before it's too late. On the eve of the Bicentennial, Americans should also ask what might have happened had our ally, France, turned its back as we struggled for freedom and independence two hundred years ago.

### IN DEFENSE OF AMBASSADOR MARTIN

Every once in a while, the United States comes up with an Ambassador who "tells it like it is"—straight from the shoulder. Such a man is Graham Anderson Martin, U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, veteran of 27 years of distinguished diplomatic service, World War II Army Colonel and one-time newsman in his native North Carolina. Ever since his arrival in Saigon last July, Ambassador Martin has been "telling it like it is," that South Vietnam is worth helping. Ambassador Martin's refreshing candor has, inevitably, drawn the ire of such perennial Vietnam critics as the *New York Times*, *Washington Post*. More recently, Senator Edward Kennedy, questioned Martin's objectivity and impartiality on Vietnam. Among those who know Ambassador Martin best is a former colleague, retired Ambassador Elbridge Durbrow.

Ambassador Durbrow: "Ambassador Martin told us that when he was assigned to South Vietnam, he decided to do all in his power to put the record straight and try to eliminate these continued distortions. He has courageously done just that by, for instance, his scathing exposé of a most distorted dispatch by a *New York Times* correspondent last February which badly misrepresented U.S. aid goals. He has also been most forthright in briefing diverse groups by giving them unvarnished facts.

"Given Ambassador Martin's determination to eliminate distortions, I fully support his telegraphed recommendations to the State Department not to give substantive answers to a series of what the Ambassador correctly called cleverly drawn, mixed-up questions on very important foreign policy problems posed by Senator Edward Kennedy. Ambassador Martin quite rightly felt that any answers to these questions could lead to still further distortions by Kennedy's Subcommittee on Refugees. Martin urged that answers to such important questions should be given, instead, to forthcoming public hearings of the main committees on Foreign Affairs. Mysteriously, Ambassador Martin's confidential recommendations were leaked to Senator Kennedy who promptly gave them to the press. That the Ambassador's concern was justified is clear from press reports quoting Kennedy as being 'outraged' that he should not be given answers about U.S. Indochina policy, and quoting Kennedy's attacks on Martin's alleged 'cover-up and deception.' It should be pointed out that Martin's telegram specifically stated that Kennedy had the right to raise the questions, but at the same time suggested that the full answers be reserved for the proper congressional committees charged with substantive foreign affairs problems—not just refugees as in the case of Kennedy's Subcommittee. Significantly, both the Senator and the news accounts ignored the Ambassador's well-founded reasons for urging that these vital questions be answered only in the proper forums."

Ambassador Elbridge Durbrow.

### WATERFRONT EDITORIAL

### HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Alexandria Journal is a prize-winning weekly newspaper in the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia noted for

its consistently solid news coverage and an editorial policy dedicated to the interests of northern Virginia and the city of Alexandria. The Journal recently published an editorial commenting on the complex and confusing problem which has surrounded proposals to develop the Alexandria waterfront. I have, as you know Mr. Speaker, been involved in this effort for sometime and I believe I can say without fear of contradiction that the Journal's editorial fairly and adequately describes the waterfront situation as it stands today. With compliments to Journal Editor Tom Wuriu, I insert the editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Alexandria Journal, June 6, 1974]

#### WASTING WATERFRONT

It is fortunate that visitors usually do not arrive in Alexandria by water. For those travelling on the Potomac, the first view of this historic city is a succession of ugly eyesores that line the waterfront for 16 blocks.

Nobody likes the dreary waterfront. Yet at a time when the city is busy with ambitious plans to attract visitors in the upcoming bicentennial years, a tiny handful of conservationists has effectively stalled efforts to settle the ownership snarl which, for years, have made it impossible to launch a comprehensive waterfront rehabilitation program.

Nearly moribund in the House of Representatives is a bill introduced by Rep. Stanford Parris (R-8th Dist.). The proposed legislation, the fruit of joint efforts by the city of Alexandria, current owners and area conservationist leaders, would provide the city with the tools to settle the legal problems and proceed with plans to revitalize the 48 acres of waterfront land.

Private development of the area would be limited to 10 acres, with the rest earmarked for parkland, a 50-foot walkway along the river and just open water. The bill contains specific restrictions as to height of buildings, distance from the waterline, etc. There are also some exceptions for present land owners.

Nearly everyone accepted the proposal, which appeared to adequately protect both public and private interests. It seemed only a matter of time before the waterfront eyesore would be wiped out.

But this was not to be. A few conservationists, not involved in the discussion, decided they really didn't approve of the compromise plan even though the attorney for the Northern Virginia Conservation Council helped draft it, and the president of that organization supported it as did many other council members and area residents.

Those who oppose the Parris plan claim the bill gives away too much to developers in terms of density and river fill rights. They don't trust the city to keep private firms from over-developing to the detriment of the community. The right course, they maintain, is to allow present federal court litigation to decide the tangled waterfront title question. Confident that the courts will find for the federal government, the conservationists want the entire disputed area turned into a park.

This tiny group of people, representing no constituency but with good connections in national conservation groups and the Department of Interior, used its influence with deadly effectiveness. As a result, the national and the Interior Department has so far declined to support it.

We do not question the sincerity of those attempting to torpedo the current waterfront legislation. We know they are highly motivated. But we do question the wisdom

of their actions in terms of the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

Certainly, the Parris bill is not perfect. There are admittedly some concessions to waterfront land owners we wish did not have to be made. And, some of the density limitations may be overly generous. But, considering the many difficult problems involved, we feel that the final package represents a reasonable compromise. And, most important, it would end the impasse which has blocked waterfront rehabilitation for so long.

As to the current court fight, which could be extended for years by appeals, there is no guarantee that the federal government will win. And, even assuming that Uncle Sam does eventually gain title to all 48 acres of disputed land (chances of that are rated poor by most experts), the possibility of federal funding for a park is remote. Department of Interior spokesmen told the Journal this week that they have no "active plans" for the waterfront.

Meanwhile, the waterfront bill remains in committee since its backers know they can't make it on the House floor without support from the conservationist camp.

All is not lost, of course. New waterfront proposals will emerge some day although Alexandria Vice Mayor Wiley Mitchell says this is the last go-around for him after more than five years of wrestling with the complex problem.

But the real losers, as we see it, will be the citizens of Alexandria and Northern Virginia who, for the foreseeable future, will be denied the obvious benefits of a waterfront renaissance.

#### TYREE GLENN, JAZZMAN

#### HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, one of the world's greatest musicians, the incomparable Duke Ellington, passed away recently. However, another well-known jazzman, Trombonist Tyree Glenn of Englewood, N.J., who at one time played with Mr. Ellington's band, also died a short while ago.

Throughout the world jazz fans and musicians were familiar with the style and the substance of Tyree Glenn's music. During his 40-year career, he played with such other greats as Lionel Hampton, Louis Armstrong, and Cab Calloway.

As prominent and talented as he was, however, Mr. Glenn still retained a sense of dedication to his community. He had appeared at Fairleigh Dickinson University and Dwight Morrow High School, in addition to donating his time to a Teaneck art workshop.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting article concerning Mr. Glenn's career appeared recently in the RECORD, a Bergen County newspaper. In view of the fact that both the jazz world and the people of the Ninth Congressional District have lost a friend, I would like to take this opportunity to insert this article in the RECORD:

TYREE GLENN, JAZZMAN

(By Bob Freeley)

ENGLEWOOD.—Tyree Glenn, noted jazz trombonist, died Saturday in Englewood Hospital. He was 61.

Mr. Glenn, a resident of Englewood for 21 years, started playing as a boy in Corsicana, Tex., where he was born. An only child whose father was a cook, Glenn started his musical career as a drummer. He later taught himself to play banjo and through the years also became skillful at the piano, the trombone, and the vibes.

Mr. Glenn played with such jazz greats as Lionel Hampton, who taught him to play the vibes, and Louis "Satchmo" Armstrong, with whom he played lead trombone for eight years. After Armstrong died, Glenn formed his own group.

During a 40-year career which started in the swing era, Glenn played "sweet" trombone with Benny Carter and Cab Calloway, and later with Duke Ellington. He joined CBS Radio in 1953 as a musician, and worked on the station for 10 years.

Although Glenn was seriously ill, and had a kidney removed last year, he and his combo played major engagements at the Royal Box of the Americana Hotel in New York during the summer and at Christmas which were credited with saving the Royal Box from closing.

Mr. Glenn was active in the Englewood community. He appeared at Dwight Morrow High School, at Fairleigh Dickinson University, and at a Teaneck art workshop.

Mr. Glenn is survived by his wife, the former Gloria Alicia; his mother, Christina Jenkins of Los Angeles; and two sons, Tyree Jr. and Roger, both musicians. Young Tyree is currently appearing with his own combo at The Riverboat in New York.

Funeral arrangements are by Walter B. Cook, Third Avenue and 85th Street in New York. Services will be Thursday at 7:30 p.m. in Central Presbyterian Church, Park Avenue at 64th Street. The Rev. John Garcia Gensel, the "Jazz Priest," will officiate.

Burial will be in George Washington Memorial Park, Paramus on Friday at 11 a.m.

#### DUKE ELLINGTON

#### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater name in American music than that of Duke Ellington who, over several decades innovated, created and dignified jazz with such skill and devotion that his name became synonymous with the best of that art form. On May 24 Edward Kennedy Ellington died, leaving a musical legacy which will probably never be equaled.

Duke Ellington was born in Washington in 1899 and grew up surrounded by a musically oriented family. In 1918 he formed his own band, first called the Duke's Serenaders and later the Washingtonians, and in 1923 they permanently moved to New York. The Band's national reputation was established during their 1927-1932 stint at Harlem's Cotton Club. During his stay there he expanded his knowledge of orchestration, orchestral color and composition; he learned from the classical composers of the time, modifying, assimilating and transforming what they offered him into a unique and original Afro-American musical idiom.

In a professional career spanning more than 50 years, Ellington was a major jazz figure of the age, not only as a composer-arranger but also as leader and pianist. As composer he covered an amazingly

wide spectrum, ranging from pop tunes to orchestral tone poems and symphonic suites, with almost every type of jazz expression in between. During his highly prolific career he composed more than 5,000 tunes, among them such classics as "Mood Indigo," "Sophisticated Lady," "Satin Doll," "Solitude," and "Blue Harlem."

The transition from the streets of Washington and the Cotton Club, to command performances for royalty was a long and arduous journey full of ineffable joy and quiet sorrow. In May 1965 the Pulitzer Prize advisory board voted that either a long-term achievement award be presented or no prize be given at all for that year. Ellington's characteristically modest comment when the board finally decided against him was quoted around the world:

Fate's being kind to me. Fate doesn't want me to be famous too young.

In 1969 President Nixon hosted a gala 70th birthday party in the Duke's honor, the highlight of which was the presentation of the Nation's highest civilian award, the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Although he won even conceivable musical honor during his lifetime, he always bore his fame with grace and dignity, never losing sight of his roots and heritage. Duke Ellington was a truly great American. We will all miss him dearly.

#### WHAT MAKES MR. NIXON RUN?

#### HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal of scepticism in this country about the purpose of Mr. Nixon's trips abroad and their potential results. In an article in the Wall Street Journal for May 31, Arthur Schlesinger notes that the Nixon-Kissinger foreign policy, while accomplishing several good things, also has had some undesirable results:

The besetting sin of the Nixon-Kissinger policy is that it expends for more concern on our enemies than on our friends, on dictatorships than on democracies. . . . This policy, by tying the United States to detested local tyrannies, also intensifies American unpopularity among peoples struggling to get on the democratic path.

Dr. Schlesinger does not believe that Mr. Nixon's personal touch, while his impeachment is pending, will add much to U.S. popularity. I would like to insert this persuasive article into the RECORD:

MR. NIXON'S MAGICAL MYSTERY TOURS

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

President Nixon has often claimed that foreign policy is his strongest suit. In his moment of extremity, he is evidently determined to play that suit for all it is worth. His plan to visit the Middle East and the Soviet Union while the House Judiciary Committee is weighing his fate therefore confronts Congress and the American people with grave and curious questions.

The only possible justification for the presidential trips must be that through his physical presence Mr. Nixon will win advantages for the United States that are not to be

won otherwise. Congress is entitled to know what these advantages might be. They are certainly not self-evident. In the Middle East Mr. Nixon would do no more than bless a settlement already worked out by Dr. Kissinger. In Moscow, if he tries to go beyond deals already completed, he would enter into negotiations from the unpromising situation of a President who, not being able to afford a failure, may be tempted to pay too high a price for an appearance of success.

Until we are told what added benefits Mr. Nixon's personal touch will bring, his magical mystery tours must be regarded as part not of the defense policy of the United States but of his own defense policy against impeachment. And if Congress, without question or objection, permits a President in almost unprecedented disrepute to wander about the world in a transparent effort to shore up a crumbling political position at home, it will quite deserve the contempt with which Mr. Nixon has been treating it.

Mr. Nixon's current strategy is to present himself, as he did in his recent seance with James J. Kilpatrick, as America's indispensable man in world affairs. If his steady hand should ever leave the tiller, this argument implies, American foreign policy will run aground or crash into the rocks. The argument hardly puts the man he recently chose as his Vice President in a flattering light. But then Mr. Nixon in the same interview indicated his opinion of Vice Presidents, especially in connection with foreign policy. Mr. Kilpatrick asked him whether he had told his Vice President of 1971 about the diplomatic opening to China. "Agnew?" Mr. Nixon replied in what Mr. Kilpatrick describes as an "incredulous" tone. "Agnew? Oh, of course not."

Mr. Nixon seems genuinely persuaded that no other American can deal as well with foreign leaders. In fact, many of the foreign leaders he has dealt with are in trouble too or are no longer around (England, France, West Germany, Israel, Egypt, Portugal, Canada, even perhaps Chou En-lai in China). And one wonders whether any realistic foreign leader these days will not be embarrassed by Mr. Nixon's drowning embrace and prefer to talk to an American President who commands a modicum of respect from his own people.

Nor, for that matter, does Mr. Nixon's argument for his personal indispensability cast a flattering light on his Secretary of State, who, there is every reason to suppose, would also be President Ford's Secretary of State. The White House story is that all Dr. Kissinger does is to execute Mr. Nixon's instructions. Without the guiding presidential hand, we are given to understand, the Secretary of State would only make a mess of things. Thus presidential spokesmen claim that Dr. Kissinger's Middle East negotiations have been subject to Mr. Nixon's constant "direction"—though reporters covering the White House, as this newspaper disclosed last week, regard this as a fiction and resent it.

#### WHO'S IN CHARGE?

Is Mr. Nixon really in daily charge of foreign affairs? Has he ever been? When he refused to meet last winter with the Senate Watergate Committee, Sen. Weicker of Connecticut sent him a list of written questions. One question noted that Mr. Nixon had said he had been too busy with foreign affairs to find out about Watergate and the cover-up; "yet your daily logs for June and July 1972 show literally hundreds of minutes for meetings with principal Watergate figures while only minutes were spent with individuals such as Dr. Kissinger." (Mr. Nixon did not respond to Sen. Weicker's observation.) The tapes have pretty well laid to rest the carefully cultivated myth of Mr. Nixon as a forceful, well-organized, decisive executive. One imagines that he can be quite as rambling and def-

erential in discussing what to do about foreign affairs with Dr. Kissinger as he was in discussing what to do about Watergate with Messrs. Haldeman, Ehrlichman, and Dean.

No doubt the President has intervened personally from time to time, as in ordering the invasion of Cambodia in 1970 and the Christmas bombings of 1972, and in so doing may even have rejected the advice of Dr. Kissinger. But the main line of the Nixon foreign policy bears less the imprint of the pre-1969 Nixon than of the pre-1969 Kissinger. The foreign policy of a Ford administration would doubtless bear the same imprint.

Even supposing that American foreign policy might change under Mr. Ford, has it been so wise and effective under Mr. Nixon that the American people should sacrifice domestic values in order to insure its continuation? No one can doubt that as a negotiator Dr. Kissinger is an invaluable national resource. His work in the Middle East in recent months has been extraordinary. His ability to enter into the viewpoints of others, his instinct for areas where compromise might be possible, his penetrating intelligence and imperturbable good cheer, his combination of tact, patience and sheer physical stamina—all these qualities make him one of the exceptional diplomats of the century.

Whether his conceptions are as impressive as his skills is another question. He sees the world essentially in terms of the political and military relations among the great powers. He is everlastingly right, of course, in his view that national interest is far more decisive than ideology in shaping a great power's policy. This view made it easier for the United States to embark on relations with Peking. But that development was not in itself any great feat of diplomatic prestidigitation. By 1969 the Chinese leaders were desperate to break out of isolation and determined to block the consolidation of a Soviet-American combine against themselves. The Chinese connection was ripe for the plucking. It did, however, require maladroit diplomacy to pluck it at such unnecessary cost for the United States in Japan and India.

The besetting sin of the Nixon-Kissinger policy is that it expends far more concern on our enemies than on our friends, on dictatorships than on democracies. It is easier to deal with leaders who can deliver their countries than with leaders who must take account of a restless internal opinion. Dr. Kissinger's impatience with the democratic governments of Western Europe, for example, has hardly been concealed. He has even questioned their legitimacy—a singular observation by the representative of a government whose own legitimacy is in doubt. But this concern for enemies, for dictatorships, for political and strategic issues may obscure other factors on the world scene. In consequence of Dr. Kissinger's preoccupations, our foreign economic policy has been a shambles, our Latin American policy dismal, our African policy largely non-existent, our European policy a failure, our United Nations policy a scandal.

#### THE TIMES' HEADLINE

Even in the countries themselves, preference for authoritarian regimes will only cause trouble for the United States in the longer run. On May 6 The New York Times had an arresting headline: "Communist Party Emerges as Strongest in Portugal." Our policy in Portugal had been to give fervent support to an authoritarian government. That government, by repressing its constitutional opponents, had predictably placed the opposition under the command of the Communists, who alone were proficient at underground organization and survival. Portugal may end up with a Communist government in another year. It may

be predicted that, so long as we pursue in Greece, Spain, Chile and elsewhere the same policy we pursued in Portugal, that policy will eventually produce the same result—and the same headline.

This policy, by tying the United States to detested local tyrannies, also intensifies American unpopularity among peoples struggling to get on the democratic path. Nor does the Nixon administration apparently find it easy to identify the United States with democratic developments. In the case of Portugal we kept our enthusiasm for the overthrow of the dictatorship under stern control. On May 3, the European Economic Community hailed the emergence of "a democratic Portugal." But the United States, so far as I have been able to discover, maintained a gloomy silence until May 22 when the American ambassador finally gave the new government a goodwill message from President Nixon.

The time may well be arriving for a re-orientation of our foreign policy. Dr. Kissinger's skills and preoccupations may have defined our international agenda long enough. He has done remarkable things, and he remains our best negotiator. We must build on his successes in detente with the Soviet Union, in opening relations with China, in the stabilization of the Middle East. But we need more than ever to pay attention to the things Dr. Kissinger has ignored: to our own hemisphere; to food, energy trade, aid, the monetary system and other international economic problems; to the United Nations.

In short, the preservation of President Nixon and his foreign policy is not necessarily what the United States most needs today. Even if it were, however, that should not be the overriding issue brought up by the movement for Mr. Nixon's impeachment. Professor Hugh Trevor-Roper, the English historian, has explained Watergate to his fellow countrymen by drawing a parallel between Watergate and Hampden's refusal to pay ship-money to Charles I. "No doubt, in the 1630s," Mr. Trevor-Roper writes, "foreigners thought the English very foolish to make such a fuss about ship-money when a firm and unhampered English government might have been effective in Europe. But the English thought first of their own liberties; and who shall say that they were wrong?"

#### BONUS MARCH OF 1974

#### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this past Memorial Day weekend was filled with many speeches honoring our veterans and those who paid the supreme sacrifice in previous wars to help preserve our freedom. Unfortunately, the veterans of the Vietnam war have been more honored by words than by any action by our Government to provide them with even adequate benefits to enable them to return to civilian life. The great frustration of Vietnam veterans has erupted with increasing frequency leading last month to the resignation of Donald Johnson, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. Despite these eruptions the Administration appears to be taking no positive action toward providing increased benefits to meet the skyrocketing cost of living which is making the existing level of veterans' benefits totally inadequate.

A new group, the American Veterans Movement, is sponsoring a nationwide pilgrimage to Washington on July 4 to remind us of the sacrifice made by veterans and the great debt that we owe to those who served in the most unpopular war in our history.

I am hoping that by the time of this march on July 4 we in the Congress will have acted to provide a more realistic level of veterans benefits.

The article follows:

#### BONUS MARCH OF 1974

(By James A. Wechsler)

Ron Kovic, a 28-year-old paraplegic Vietnam veteran with a fighting heart and unbroken spirit, never made Richard Nixon's "enemies list." But he may play a large role in climactic summer scenes of the Nixon era.

Kovic is a major leader and voice of the new American Veterans Movement sponsoring a nationwide pilgrimage to Washington. July 4 is the date on which organizers of the march now confidently predict that "many thousands" of veterans—of Vietnam and other wars—will assemble in the capital to protest "the national veterans crisis."

"We'll stay there until the Administration has decisively acted—whether we have to stay until Christmas or 1976," Kovic said when we talked the other day.

"This will be a peaceful occupation—at least we're doing everything we can to make it peaceful and we're asking the Administration to help us keep it that way by working out arrangements with us. But it won't be a one-day outing."

I first met and wrote about Kovic last March, shortly after he and a group of other AVM members had won national notice by staging a hunger strike in Sen. Alan Cranston's Los Angeles office. They were a small band then—10 of them, like Kovic, disabled—but their protest over the treatment being accorded veterans in VA hospitals and on other fronts had swift repercussions in Washington.

It was an important measure as a result of his ineptness in dealing with the group that VA chief Donald E. Johnson found himself announcing a little more than a month later that he would leave his post in early June.

Johnson's departure announcement followed widespread outcry over President Nixon's "Vietnam Veterans Day" address in which he announced, among other things, that he had named Johnson to head a "study" of conditions in VA hospitals and other grievances. On Capitol Hill and elsewhere, the prospect of Johnson in effect investigating his own regime quickly backfired, and he became expendable.

So far no successor has been designated. But Kovic, emphasizing that the identity of Johnson's successor would not alter plans for the Washington "occupation," said: "One man resigning doesn't end the abuses we're fighting."

In its call for participation in the drive, the AVM specifically urges "larger and better equipped hospitals . . . A workable GI bill . . . Adequate veterans compensation . . . Humane homes for disabled vets . . . More jobs for veterans."

Although discontent over the VA administration had surfaced at Congressional hearings and in other areas for some time, the old-line veterans organizations remained largely undemonstrative. Their passivity created a vacuum into which Kovic and his associates have moved. But in doing so the AVM has endeavored to avoid combat with the other groups and believes its march will evoke broad sympathy if not official endorsement from diverse contingents.

Kovic, a 1964 Massapequa HS graduate who enlisted in the Marines three months

after finishing school, spoke recently to the Massapequa Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Meanwhile there have been other very tangible expressions of support. In Las Vegas, for example, 836 members of the American Legion have signed up to board the train that will leave Los Angeles June 14, pausing at numerous cities along the way to pick up recruits. In Portland, Ore., an 89-year-old World War I veteran is joining his Vietnam vet grandson for the journey. Another train will start out from Boston July 3, stopping in New York en route.

Kovic said AVM spokesmen have been in contact with Amtrak officials and are hopeful they will provide trains.

"But one way or another we'll get the transportation," he added. Committees in charge of "logistics and food" have already been set up in 11 major cities.

In Washington the veterans are planning to set up a large encampment in the area where the Southern Christian Leadership Conference built "Resurrection City." While a White House aide—James Cavanaugh—met with AVM leaders on March 31, attempts to arrange further conferences with him have been unsuccessful.

Kovic is deeply conscious of both the tradition and stormy history of the Bonus March of 1932. His stress on the "nonviolent" character of the coming demonstration is no doubt influenced by reading of the tragic MacArthur military operation that finally dispersed the Bonus Expeditionary Force in that last summer of Hooverism.

There are both similarities and disparities between that pilgrimage and the one now taking shape. The BEF concentrated almost entirely on a vain fight for the immediate payment of "adjusted compensation." Congress had authorized to be paid in 1945. This year's marchers will be seeking more than fiscal redress, as their preoccupation with the state of VA hospitals indicates.

But one parallel is hauntingly inescapable. Then, as now, a U.S. President faced the steady, deadly disintegration of his Administration. While the circumstances differed in some essential respects from the present, the jobless, dispossessed veterans who were ultimately driven out dramatized the aloof impotence of national leadership. The symbolism of the 1974 march cannot be missed at the White House.

#### PROPERTY RIGHTS AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 10294

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time during consideration of H.R. 10294, I intend to offer the following amendment:

#### PROPERTY RIGHTS AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 10294

Amendment No. 1 (Findings Section—101):  
Page 26, line 18: After the semicolon strike the word "and".

Page 27, line 2: Strike the period at the end of paragraph (11) and add the following: "and".

"(12) Uncoordinated, widely varying and frequently inconsistent efforts to deal with land use problems through the application of traditional zoning controls, special area protection and enhancement methods and other land use control programs have created substantial uncertainties and imposed significant burdens on property owners, which the courts have not resolved in a consistent and predictable manner, regarding the

rights, dispositions and future uses of private lands affected by such controls; efforts to expand the scope and reach of such controls will only magnify these problems."

Amendment No. 2 (Policy Section—102):  
Page 27, line 17: Add a comma immediately after the word "land".

Page 27, line 18: Strike the word "and" where it first appears.

Page 27, line 19: Strike the period and add the following immediately after the word "processes": ", and that provide more explicit guidance for the equitable resolutions of conflicts between property ownership rights and public and community interests, needs and benefits."

Amendment No. 3: (State planning process Section—104):

Page 32, line 16: Strike the word "and".

Page 34, line 7: At the end of paragraph (i) add the following:

"(j) development of explicit substantive State policies to deal with legal conflicts between private property interests and public and community interests furthered by implementation of the comprehensive state land use planning process, including—

"(1) specification of the planning, control and regulatory techniques, other than payment of compensation to property owners, to be utilized in the furtherance of land use planning objectives;

"(2) review and compilation of relevant state laws, administrative regulations and practices, and case-law and other judicial determinations that may tend to encourage, sanction, restrain, limit or prohibit the utilization of such techniques; and

"(3) to the extent practicable and feasible, development of the general policies to be applied by the state land use agency for providing compensation to land-owners, or for utilizing a combination of compensation and regulation, in these instances where the findings of the review pursuant to paragraph (2) indicate that land use planning policies and objectives may not be appropriately or constitutionally implemented by means of regulatory techniques alone."

Amendment No. 4 (Implementation Section—106):

Page 38, line 4: Strike the word "and".

Page 39, line 10: Strike the period and add the following: "; and".

"(3) An appeal procedure affording any affected property owner the opportunity to challenge or contest policies adopted pursuant to Sec. 104(j)(3) to the extent that they are deemed incompatible with the findings of Sec. 101(j)(2); *Provided that*, the state land use agency shall bear the responsibility to demonstrate that such policies are not inconsistent, incompatible or otherwise at variance with State law, including any judicial interpretation thereof, as defined pursuant to Sec. 104(j)(2)."

#### THE COST OF LIVING

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the rising cost of living seems to be the most difficult for those persons over 65. Their pensions and social security together are not enough to make ends meet. The proposed social security increase will curtail the problem somewhat, but it will not be enough.

The following article expresses the concern and required lifestyle of a couple in Pennsylvania. I hope this will be interesting to my colleagues:

# WITH \$5,684 A YEAR, RETIRED COUPLE'S LIFE IS TEST OF ENDURANCE

(By Roy J. Harris, Jr.)

McKEESPORT, Pa.—Reflecting on the 23 years that he spent as a pipe fitter's helper at U.S. Steel Corp.'s Duquesne Works, Henry Harff matter-of-factly says the experience tested the limits of his endurance.

"It was hard and it was hot and you sweated until you were soaking wet from head to foot," recalls Mr. Harff, who is 72 years old and has been retired for seven years now. If his assignment happened to be repairing the pipes under a massive open-hearth furnace, he says, "you couldn't hardly stay long enough to fit the wrench. You had to get out because you couldn't breathe. In the open, you could have done the job in an hour. But in that hell it was a different thing."

There was danger, too: "If that furnace would break, you'd be a puff of smoke."

The danger and the discomfort of the Duquesne open hearths (all of which have since been replaced by more modern equipment) are just distant, if distinct, memories for Henry Harff. But his endurance is still being tested. Now, he and his 70-year-old wife, Gertrude, like millions of other Americans living on retirement incomes, are laboring hard to keep inflation from destroying their pride, if not their very lives. As Mr. Harff puts it: "You have to keep alert to keep alive."

## MAKING ENDS MEET

So far, the Harffs have been able to make ends meet and keep destitution from the doorstep of the yellow and green bungalow built 33 years ago by Mr. Harff in this industrial town a few miles up the Monongahela River from Pittsburgh. Indeed, because the couple receive a monthly pension check of \$132 in addition to their \$341.70 monthly Social Security payment—a total of \$5,684.40 a year—they are more fortunate than those couples who are 65 and older and who live on Social Security alone. (There are currently two million couples aged 65 and over who are receiving Social Security payments. Of this total, 80% receive no additional pension benefits—although they may have income from other sources.)

Henry Harff, however, doesn't view himself as fortunate at all. Rather, he sees himself as the victim of a cruel joke, the irony lying in his current monetary plight after a lifetime of, as he puts it, "going through the mill." Looking back, he says, "If I had it all to do over again, this little 130-pounder wouldn't have gone hunting all the hard work I did. I worked like a jackass all my life."

If Mr. Harff isn't filled with pride about the fruits of his labor, he and Mrs. Harff nevertheless are proud when they consider that they have managed to survive without going into debt. "I'm clean and respected in the community," Mr. Harff says. "I owe no man anything."

## INDEPENDENT SPIRIT

The Harffs' almost puritanical concern with cleanliness, respect and financial independence is evident after only a few minutes in their house, which stands at the foot of an eroded hill on the outskirts of McKeesport, just across the Monongahela from the Duquesne works. The bungalow's Spartan kitchen and living room are spotless. And conversation with a recent visitor quickly turns to a worrisome subject: the cost of living.

"It seems the older you get, the more you're punished for being old," Mr. Harff muses. "If you find a retiree older than I am, you'll find a beggar."

In their early retirement years, the Harffs countered the shock of losing their \$550-a-month working income by restricting—and finally eliminating—such pleas-

ures as travel and occasional restaurant eating. They also soon discovered that they were unable to save any money at all on their first monthly retirement benefits, which amounted to about \$185 in Social Security and \$115 in private pension benefits.

## KEEPING UP

From 1966 through 1973, the government's consumer price index jumped 36.9%. The Harffs' income, like that of numerous retired Americans, rose at more than twice that rate, largely due to Social Security increases. Mr. Harff's private pension, however, climbed by only 10%. And because their Social Security benefits were so small to begin with, the Harffs' income, even with the increases, is still only slightly more than the median annual income for elderly couples, last figured in 1972 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics at \$5,513.

Mr. Harff and his wife have adopted a routine of cashing the pension check, which comes on the 28th of each month, and then combining it with the cash from the Social Security check, which arrives on the 3rd. From this modest kitty, they make their payments and hope to be even by the next time the 28th rolls around.

Since they own their house outright, the Harffs have no rent or mortgage payments to worry about. And while Mr. Harff says that there are school-district, borough and county property taxes totaling "several hundred dollars" a year to be paid, he adds that the couple's chief source of concern is the price of food.

Henry Harff considers fresh fruits and vegetables a necessity for good health. He was therefore elated when a friendly market manager recently offered to sell him spotted apples, bruised tomatoes and other damaged but edible items at a discount. A recent jump in the price of tomatoes to 59 cents a pound—more than double the 25 cents a pound Mr. Harff remembers paying only a few years ago—forced him to look for the special deal, he says.

Some food items have been completely eliminated from the Harffs' shopping list. These include two of Mr. Harff's favorite meats—ham and pork chops. When center-cut chops reached \$1.39 a pound last year, he says, the couple started to buy link sausage as a substitute. When that product also climbed to \$1.39 a pound, they switched to fatter rolled sausage at 79 cents a pound. The Harffs also buy only day-old bakery items now, since the price of bread jumped to 56 cents for a big loaf, up from 25 cents 18 months ago. The day-old variety sells for half price.

A typical midday meal in the Harff household consists of Braunschweiger sandwiches and a canned vegetable, the latter usually purchased at a discount with the aid of newspaper coupons that are kept stacked under a centerpiece of the kitchen table. Their granddaughter, Trudy Vandervort, visiting with her son, David, observes that "if I ate as much as they did, I'd starve." Gertrude Harff, however, serenely assures her that "we're used to this."

The Harffs' economizing has also involved clothing, and their purchases in this area are currently contingent upon what bargains can be found at a local flea market. Last year, they bought a winter coat for Mrs. Harff for \$4, but Mr. Harff points out that the total cost was actually somewhat higher because some alterations were needed. (Even so, Mrs. Vandervort is impressed. "I can't find bargains like that," she tells her grandmother. "They must feel sorry for you.")

Occasionally, the Harffs drive to a nearby shopping center, but it isn't always to shop. "They go up to Zayre's and just watch the people," Mrs. Vandervort says. And even their people-watching isn't a free pleasure, as Mr. Harff reminds his granddaughter, since gaso-

line now is 56 cents a gallon. Accordingly, Mr. Harff normally only uses his 1966 Chevrolet for short drives to pickup a newspaper or a few grocery items.

Among Mr. Harff's other activities are such physical activities as cutting his own lawn and doing his own gardening, both of which he sees as investments in fitness as well as thrift measures. Both he and his wife enjoy reading and like to have the house filled with books, many of which they purchase for a dime each at a local flea market. And Mr. Harff also sees to it that he gets to attend 10 wrestling matches a year in Pittsburgh—a little luxury (a ticket costs \$2.50), but one that he isn't inclined to forgo.

## HOW MUCH DOES IT COST?

Almost everything the Harffs do is seen in terms of the money it costs, and this extends to such seemingly inexpensive pursuits as watching over the birds that frequent the couple's backyard. "You know it costs money to feed them," Mr. Harff declares, and with pencil and paper he arrives at a \$4-a-month estimate for bread and seed.

This attention to financial detail doesn't extend to all areas of the Harffs' expenditures. As a general rule, they simply accept the fact that their total outflow equals their total income. Mr. Harff, however, can cite such specifics as the \$480 a year that goes for medicine to treat such infirmities as Mrs. Harff's circulatory problems. The specter of even larger medical expenses—such as a hospital stay that might not be completely covered by insurance—hangs over the couple as a major worry, albeit one they prefer not to ponder too much. (The Harffs are covered by Medicare and Blue Cross insurance, the latter tied into the steelworkers' union retirement system. Together, the two kinds of insurance are supposed to pay full medical costs, but Mr. Harff complains that once when he smashed his finger he had to pay \$15 of the \$35 bill from the doctor.)

To take their minds off any morbid speculation about the future, the Harffs have a major source of present enjoyment: their family. Indeed, it is readily apparent that their daughter, three grandchildren and two great-grandchildren add a measure of vicarious youth and an abundance of happiness to the elderly couple's days—so much so that all thoughts of budgeting seem to disappear when the youngsters come to call. "If this woman finds out the grandchildren don't have shoes, she'll take money and buy shoes," Mr. Harff says of his wife. And any visit from a family member is likely to prompt a token gift, such as some rhubarb from the yard, some soap powder, or perhaps an item that the Harffs purchased on sale. The great-grandchildren rarely leave the Harffs' house without a few coins clutched in their fists.

"When you've got children, you love them," Mr. Harff explains. "But when you've got grandchildren, you lose your mind."

## A BIT OF RELIEF

The Harffs' financial situation will improve to some extent in July, when a Social Security increase will go into effect, and again in August 1975 when Mr. Harff's monthly pension will be boosted by \$26.40 (the result of a recent labor contract addendum affecting past retirees). But even so, he is skeptical about whether he will be able to do more than keep up with the price of food, taxes and other costs.

Today, Mr. Harff wishes that he had had more years of service with U.S. Steel, which would have brought him a hefty pension, or that he had thought more about saving money for his retirement. He sighs when he talks about a friend of his, a recently retired steelworker who is receiving far higher benefits from a newer contract and was therefore able to take a vacation trip to Hawaii. "It didn't cost a million," Mr. Harff says, "but it cost quite a bit."

If he and his wife could afford a trip, Henry Harff says, they would go to Europe so that he could visit a cousin in Germany and she could see Holland. If they could save \$10 or \$20 a week, he muses, they might go. But then he returns to reality: "I can't even dream about that," he says, noting that in seven years they haven't saved a dime.

#### INHUMAN TORTURES AT THE SECURITY OFFICES AND ESA

#### HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a representative of the American Committee for Democracy in Greece has sent me a translation of an article which appeared in the London-based Greek-language newspaper *Eleftheria Patrida* on May 2. The newspaper story details charges of torture and atrocities committed against political prisoners held by the military dictatorship that rules Greece. Unfortunately, torture of political prisoners remains a widespread practice and it must be condemned wherever it appears. I hope that the State Department will look into these charges and, if it finds they are true, that it will issue a public protest against such violations of human decency.

The article follows:

#### INHUMAN TORTURES AT THE SECURITY OFFICES AND ESA

ATHENS, April 25.—It is now known that the 50 patriots who disappeared on Good Thursday morning, April 11, from the Security Building where they had been held since February 19, are in the Boyati prison (a few miles outside Athens-NS). They are being subjected to inhuman, medieval tortures.

Among the 50 are Nicos Kaloudis, who has had three heart attacks; Nicos Koutroumbas, who had had one heart attack, and serious war injuries; Antonis Ambatielos, over 60 and in poor health; Yiannis Palavas, also very ill; and many more with equally serious health problems.

According to verified information, groups of specialized torturers have been formed and moved to the Boyati prison where they work steadily 24 hours a day torturing the political prisoners to force them to admit to the preposterous accusations that Mallios and Paulos have concocted. The prisoners are passed from one group of torturers to the next. In addition to the questioning, threats, loss of sleep, and forced standing, each "group" beats the prisoners with brass knuckles and clubs. If a prisoner faints he is doused with buckets of water. On regaining consciousness, he is moved to the next group.

Mallios and Mihelis have told some prisoners' families that their people are in Boyati but as prisoners of the General Security of Athens and not of ESA (military police). Paulos said on Good Thursday that the prisoners "were moved to Boyati so they could fare better." It is now evident that this transfer was made with the understanding that Ioannides' ESA torturers would take over. Authorities are now trying to build up a case in order to start a spectacular trial which they hope will conceal the mass murder of students last November as well as their other crimes.

On April 3, wives of political prisoners and

exiles, and of those held at the Security stations, visited the Minister of Public Order Tsoumanli. They asked for freedom for their people, or to allow visiting privileges. His answer was: "I can do nothing. It is a government matter. You are right. But you must be patient." They told him that he is the one who signs the rejection papers so he cannot contend that he can do nothing. He gave no answer. They gave him two resolutions—applications in the cases of the prisoners Pappariga and Tsokos. He promised to study the matter, repeating that it was just a governmental problem.

Tsoumanli then called an agency for information and told the prisoners' wives that the Court Martial will decide their fate. He was shown the bloody clothes of the prisoner Gontika, and could only shake his head sadly.

Tsoumanli receives people in audience with two persons in attendance who apparently follow his discussions and replies. The prisoners' families then visited the foreign press agencies and told them about the plight of the political prisoners.

Gontika's wife received her husband's bloodstained underwear on April 2. She too saw Tsoumanli and then went to the Red Cross, whose representative tried unsuccessfully to see the prisoners. The Security promised, however, to allow Gontika to see his wife. Instead, on April 7, they gave her three changes of his clothes. They were bloody, smeared with excrement and hair. They also returned, half-eaten, the food she brought for him.

On April 10, they showed prisoners, in groups of five, to their relatives. Among them was Gontikas who was supported by his comrades. He had no fingernails or toenails. He is only 27 years old and looked 60; only his eyes shone like two suns. His young wife wept. Their 1½ year old daughter gave him a flower but he couldn't hold it in his broken hands.

Other prisoners are similarly maltreated and in spite of their guards' warnings, some managed to show their families their torn and swollen feet—the result of the "falanga." A girl student whose name and age were not available was kept in a cell at the Security building for two months, with five sex deviates whose behavior caused her to suffer severe nervous shock.

The military court sentenced Maria Hadjinicalaou and Panos Papadopoulos to 2 years in prison even though the prosecutor had asked for 1 year. During the trial both prisoners exhibited scars and wounds from their tortures. Papadopoulos had been tortured in the genitals. They had wrapped him in newspapers, ignited the paper, and at the same time shocked his body with electricity. They placed a gadget in his mouth that causes asphyxia and which they call "wolf." For both prisoners, the well-known torturer Karapanayotis was the witness for the prosecution.

In Perissos (a village-NS) at the Cendarme building, many students have been held for 2 and 3 months. The student Niakis Balaouras was released in April and Grivas and Damigos were sent to Yourea.

Topoulian, a civil engineer, was arrested in the beginning of April by 8 military police and is being held incommunicado at the ESA of Agia Pataskeul. His family is not allowed to visit him.

On Good Friday, parents of prisoners and those being tortured, asked to see the Archbishop Serafim. Serafim answered through his secretary that, "Today is Good Friday and he is totally absorbed with the Crucified One." At that moment, torturers were crucifying dozens of patriots, apparently with his knowledge and blessing.

#### FUEL CELLS—ANOTHER SPACE SPINOFF MAKES GOOD

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the May 1974 edition of Government Executive magazine carried a significant article on the application of fuel cells developed in our national program to provide power for our homes and industry. This important development, as the article points out, is being readied today for use. It represents another example of the direct benefits our space program is providing to the quality of life of the people of this Nation. The article follows:

#### FUEL CELLS—ANOTHER SPACE SPINOFF MAKES GOOD

For the very distant future—say the third decade of the 21st Century—the space buffs talk of wondrous satellite systems capable of collecting solar energy and transmitting it by microwave to earthbound power plants.

But, at the moment, another space program spinoff benefit—the fuel cell—seems a good bet to contribute significantly toward the easing of the Nation's energy pinch in the relatively near term—which is to say, in the early 1980s.

First practical application of the fuel cell for producing electricity and water occurred in the U.S. manned space program. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration used the power conversion devices in its *Gemini*, *Apollo* and *Skylab* programs. Fuel cells built by Pratt & Whitney Aircraft powered *Apollo* and *Skylab* spacecraft, and supplying fuel cells for the *Space Shuttle* program.

To critics who claim the free enterprise system has been apathetic about developing technology needed to ease the energy pinch, the cooperative private sector program to develop fuel cells for commercial use is instructive.

Soon after Pratt & Whitney won the *Apollo* fuel cell contract, it moved to open up the commercial market for the devices.

The first commercial breakthrough occurred in the gas industry in 1962 at a time gas companies were steadily losing customers to electric utilities.

That year, a P&W team headed by William H. Podolny provided a 500-watt experimental unit for a Columbia Gas Systems pumping station at Stanton, Ky.

In 1966, P&W set up a 3.75-kilowatt fuel cell unit for Columbia Gas, and, in January 1967, 28 gas utilities formed a nonprofit corporation called TARGET (Team to Advance Research for Gas Energy Transformation) to work with P&W in developing natural gas fuel cells to generate economic electric power at onsite locations such as apartment buildings and shopping centers. More than three dozen experimental gas units now are operating in the United States and Japan.

Throughout the 1960s, electric utilities remained cool to the potential of the fuel cell. But when four utilities that supply both gas and electricity joined the Target effort in 1971, Podolny's team took a closer look at electric power fuel cell applications.

In November 1971, 10 electric utility companies and the Edison Electric Institute underwrote a \$3 million P&W study program, and last year another \$9 million was pumped into the program by the Electric Power Research Institute.

A few months ago, Pratt & Whitney announced a program with an expected eventual price tag of \$250 million to develop a 26-megawatt fuel cell for electric utilities to supplement traditional steam, nuclear, gas turbine and hydro-generation methods.

Funding arrangements for the program are unprecedented in the industry. P&W is putting up \$14 million, and nine utilities are contributing \$7 million for a prior demonstration unit during the first phase. And the electric companies are providing \$28 million as down payments on 56 fuel cell plants, some targeted for as early as 1978.

Each 26-megawatt plant will be capable of serving electrical needs of 20,000 people. While the plants will not be large enough to meet base-load power demands, they are viewed as important complementary sources for existing generation systems during intermediate and peak-load periods and are expected to supply as much as 15% of the yearly add-on in industry capacity.

Fuel cells have many advantages over traditional generation methods. Among these: They chemically convert fossil fuel to processed fuel rich in hydrogen, which then is converted to electricity, without combustion or moving parts. Air, water, thermal and noise pollution are all but eliminated—an important plus for electric utilities which have been favorite targets of environmentalists.

The devices are highly efficient.

Any liquid or gaseous hydrocarbon fuel can be used in the conversion process. For the future, synthetic natural gas made from coal is a possibility. New units, however, will use distillate fuel at first and perhaps heavier oils later.

Because a fuel cell can draw more energy from a fuel source than conventional stations can, limited fuel supplies can be conserved. "When there are limited supplies of distillate fuel," Podolny says, "it is important that we get the maximum amount of energy out of what is available."

Plant siting problems are reduced. Units can be deployed either individually or in multiples, according to demands of an individual electric company. They do not intrude on the landscape, and can be located in congested urban areas, suburbs or rural areas. A 26-megawatt unit can be sited on half an acre.

Participating with P & W in the privately-financed endeavor are Boston Edison, Consolidated Edison of New York, Consumers Power Co. of Michigan, New England Electric, Niagara Mohawk of New York, Northeast Utilities of Connecticut, Philadelphia Electric, Public Service Electric and Gas of New Jersey and Southern California Edison.

The program got under way without Government support. While justifiably proud of the private sector's accomplishments, however, Pratt & Whitney, noting the new interest in Washington, D.C., in advanced energy-related technologies, has let it be known that "we would welcome Government participation in our program."

ELIZABETH WACHS

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, Elizabeth Wachs, a distinguished member of the Brooklyn, Ohio, City Council, passed away. She gave 27 years of her life to serving her people and her magnificent community. She

was the type of person who went beyond what was required of her to insure that those who needed help were given it. She never failed her city in tasks both big and small and will be greatly missed by many people.

I would like at this time to insert this editorial concerning her, from the Parma Sun Post, into the Record:

#### THEY CARED

They cared. They were there when help was needed. They served their communities with dedication and honor.

Councilman Elizabeth Wachs died May 24. For 27 years she served with great distinction as a legislator in Brooklyn.

Cleveland councilman Michael Zone, a city legislator since 1960, died June 2. Few have ever matched him as a concerned public official.

Both will be missed. Not only by those who knew them on council or by those who they aided in times of distress, but by anyone who took the time to really view them as "people oriented" legislators—councilmen with the quality to go beyond their normal duties.

Cleveland Council President George Forbes described Zone as "a patient and understanding father without any generation gap, a devoted son and a friend of all—a friend whose sage advice was sought by the politician and treasured by the newest immigrant."

Brooklyn Mayor John Coyne said Mrs. Wachs was not only an excellent councilman "but a friend to all, one who was concerned enough to do more than anyone could expect of her." She always found time, he continued, to lend a hand in any difficult situation—whether it was a small problem a resident faced or the creation of a major city project.

They left an endless list of accomplishments to their credit. And there were always the smaller difficulties they helped solve that only their constituents will know about.

We mourn the deaths of both public officials.

But they left behind some things to believe in, some things to cherish.

Honestly. Loyalty. Dependability. Respectability. Dedication. That's what Michael Zone and Elizabeth Wachs stood for.

But most of all they cared.

#### IMPEACHMENT SHOULD BE THE FIRST PRIORITY OF BUSINESS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the subject of the impeachment of President Richard M. Nixon has received the attention it deserves in the news media of this country. This subject is the most important question facing the Nation and it cannot remain unresolved. Yet the House and the Senate appear to be insensitive to the need to resolve this question as soon as possible. It is only natural that the President would attempt to delay any congressional decision, but his actions should only strengthen the will of the Congress to move ahead.

We now know that a Federal grand jury unanimously found the President to be a coconspirator in the Watergate coverup. In addition to those charges,

which are contained in the pending resolutions of impeachment, the President is charged with other high crimes and misdemeanors. The President's most recent refusal to comply with subpoenas are still more grounds for impeachment. The fact of the matter is, the President is charged with impeachable offenses that can only be resolved by a trial in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the duty nor the responsibility of the House to conduct a trial on the charges against the President. The President's counsel can claim what he wishes, but we need only find merit in the charges. My own determination is that the President has violated his oath of office and committed impeachable offenses.

Only a Senate trial can now determine if the President is innocent of all charges against him. It is the responsibility of the House to be the people's advocate, the prosecutor if you will. It is only the Senate's duty to be a jury.

The President is charged with crimes against the people of the United States. Yet we carry on business as usual, and the President is leaving the country while still under serious unresolved charges. This is a subject that should and must have the utmost attention of the Congress.

The impeachment of President Nixon must be the first priority of this Congress. I urge the House Judiciary Committee to bring this matter to a quick vote in the House and a speedy trial in the Senate.

#### SAUNDRA TAYLOR NAMED MISS BLACK JOLIET

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, recently Sandra Taylor of my hometown was selected as Miss Black Joliet. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Ms. Taylor on her achievement and wish her similar success when she competes for the title of Miss Black Illinois in Chicago.

I am submitting for the Record an account of her victory that appeared in the Joliet Herald-News.

JJC STUDENT SINGER SELECTED MISS BLACK JOLIET

Sandra Taylor is Miss Black Joliet 1974. The 18-year-old Ms. Taylor is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Lewis Taylor of 1912 South Chicago St. A graduate of Joliet East High School and now in her second year at Joliet Junior College, where she has been preparing for a career in special education, Ms. Taylor will head next for the Miss Black Illinois Contest in Chicago.

Ms. Taylor was selected Saturday evening from among six finalists in the fourth annual event. Mary Alice Banks, 18, of 2217 Fairmont Ave. in Lockport was first runner-up. Gina Rutledge, also 18, of 1511 Cutter Ave. was second runner-up.

All girls were judged in talent, swimsuit and evening gown competition at the Joliet Central High School Auditorium. The contest was sponsored by the Women's Auxiliary

for Concerned Veterans of Vietnam and the Freedom Club of Joliet.

No stranger to the contest, Ms. Taylor has viewed the proceedings for the last two years, but not as a contestant. A member of the "Stylesetters" entertainers, she participated in the contest shows during the last two years.

This year, Ms. Taylor sang "My Imagination" in the talent competition.

# FORT WADSWORTH COMMITTEE FOR A LIVING NATIONAL PARK MEMORIAL

## HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Leo A. Boller, chairman of the Fort Wadsworth Committee for a Living National Park Memorial, has been active in trying to help our POW's and MIA's. He has obtained signatures of many students of the New York area, and he, the students, and members of the committee have taken their message to the United Nations.

In hope that further recognition will help Mr. Boller in his worthy efforts, I would like to insert a letter from Mr. Boller and a list of the members of the Fort Wadsworth Committee for a Living National Park Memorial in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

MAY 28, 1974.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,  
House of Representatives, Rayburn House  
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLFF: As a member of this Committee,\* Congress Wolff, you will be pleased to know that we held a "Students' Petition Day at the United Nations for our MIAs and POWs" on May 24, 1974 at 11:00 A.M. The honorable Bradford Morse, Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations most graciously received the students, educators and members of this Committee in his boardroom on the thirty-eighth floor of the United Nations. Mr. Morse assured us that he would set this humanitarian endeavor in motion for our MIAs and POWs. The five Borough Presidents of New York City and Nassau and Suffolk County Executives kindly proclaimed this day. After the presentation we were given a private tour of the United Nations. The students' enthusiasm in being instrumental in saving our mens' lives is inspiring and they were pleased to know that the President was aware of what they were trying to accomplish. Many plan to continue to obtain signatures from their schoolmates and if this could be read into the Congressional Record, it may encourage more to join in this patriotic endeavor for our servicemen and their families. On or about July 4, 1974 a subsequent delivery to the United Nations will be made... for our men's independence on our Independence Day!!!

(Student petitions were received from Metropolitan New York, Rochester, N.Y., New Jersey, and New Mexico.)

With very best wishes,

Sincerely,

LEO A. BOLLER,  
Chairman.

# FORT WADSWORTH COMMITTEE FOR A LIVING NATIONAL PARK MEMORIAL

Leo A. Boller, Chairman, Retired, N.Y.C. Police Department, Member of Honor Legion of Police Dept.

Ann J. Boller, Vice Chairman and Secretary.

\*Loring McMillen, Committee's Historian, Director, S.I. Historical Society, Richmondtown, NY, ARBC.

\*Oliver Jensen, Editor, American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., Fifth Avenue, New York.

William E. Milacek, Commander, Catholic War Veterans, Department of New York State.

Raymond C. Fingado, Administrative Assistant, S.I., N.Y. Historical Society Richmondtown.

Nathan L. Wolfson, Commander, Jewish War Veterans, Department of New York State.

Frank F. DiSogra, Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Richmond County Council, S.I., N.Y.

\*Karl B. Justus, Executive Director, Military Chaplains Association of U.S.A., Washington, D.C.

Robert W. Garlinger, Commander, The American Legion, Department of New York State.

Warren S. Woodward, Exec. Sec., National Society Sons American Revolution, Natl. Hdqrs, Washington, D.C.

Frank J. Schira, Exec. Director, National Police Officers Assoc. American, Natl. Headquarters, Florida.

Kenneth T. Jackson, Sec-Treas., Society of American Historians, Columbia University, New York.

James H. Driscoll, Secretary, National Democratic Club, Madison Avenue, New York.

Robert D. Carter, Acting Executive Director, Blinded Veterans Association, Washington, D.C.

Edward S. Malone, Past National Executive Committeeman, Disabled American Veterans, New York.

J. B. Koch, Commander, Veterans of World War I of USA, National Headquarters, Alexandria, Virginia.

Edward J. Kiernan, President, Patrolmen's Benevolent Association of N.Y.C. Police Department.

Thomas J. Mooney, Vice President, United States National Student Association, Washington, D.C.

Frank C. Flini, Executive Director, Air Force Sergeants Association, Washington, D.C.

Margaret S. Cirbus, Corresp. Secretary, Soroptimist Club of S.I., N.Y. (Professional & Business Women).

\*Louis R. Bruce, Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Dept. of Interior, Washington, D.C.

John M. York, Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of New York State.

Howard H. Spooner, Commander, Veterans of World War I of USA, S.I. Barracks #2524, S.I., N.Y.

Vicent A. Tabano, President, The Honor Legion of the Police Department of the City of New York.

\*Colonel Harold G. Barry, The Chief Secretary, The Salvation Army, Territorial Headquarters, N.Y.

\*Henry Allen Moe, President and Board Chairman, New York State Historical Association, New York.

Francis L. Butt, National Commander, The Boys' Brigade of America, Baltimore, Maryland.

\*Floyd B. Taylor, National Park Service Landmarks Specialist, U.S. Dept. of Interior, N.P. Service, N.Y.

William B. Flynn, President, Retired Patrolmen Association, Inc., N.Y. Police Department, N.Y.

Steve Hallock, National Adjutant, Army and Navy Union, U.S.A., National Headquarters, Niles, Ohio.

Salvatore Violante, Commander, Disabled American Veterans, Astoria Chapter #29, Long Island City, N.Y.

\*John M. Murphy, Member of Congress, Congress of the U.S., House of Representatives, Wash., DC. (S.I.)

\*James A. McDivitt, BG-USAF, Apollo Spacecraft Mgr., Natl. Aeronautics & Space Administration, Houston, Texas.

Hallett D. Edson, BG-Ret, Exec. Vice Pres., National Association for Uniformed Services, Arlington, Va.

William C. LaMorte, President, Kiwanis Club of North Shore Staten Island, York Avenue, S.I., N.Y.

\*John T. Satriale, Esq., Former N.Y.S. Assemblyman, New York, New York; ARBC.

\*Rabbi William Berkowitz, President, The New York Board of Rabbis, Inc., New York, New York.

J. Joseph Smith, Past County Commander, Chairman Life Membership Committee, Dept. of New York, Vets. of Foreign Wars.

Alfred M. Francia, Chef De Gare, Societe 40 Hommes, 8 Chevaux (The Forty & Eight) The American Legion, Loc. 595, S.I.

\*August Heckscher, Administrator, Commissioner of Parks, The City of New York, Parks, Rec. & Cultural Affairs.

Charles Phillips Sturges, Governor General, General Society of Colonial Wars, Chicago, Illinois.

Bernard Berggren, Area Vice President, Area II, American Association of Retired Persons, S.I., N.Y.

\*Dr. James J. Flynn, Chairman, History & Political Science Dept., St. Francis College, Bklyn; Historian of Queens, AREC.

\*Lester L. Wolff, Member of Congress, Congress of the U.S., House of Representatives, Wash. D.C. (Queens)

\*Rev. Edward Lodge Curran, Ph. D., Pastor, St. Sebastian's Roman Catholic Church, Woodside, N.Y.; AREC.

\*George Meany, President, American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, Wash., D.C.

\*Harold B. Say, Editor, The Stars and Stripes, The National Tribune, Washington, D.C.

\*Matthew J. Troy, Jr., Councilman, The City of New York, 16th District, Queens, N.Y.; ARBC.

\*George O. Pratt, Jr., Director, Staten Island Institute of Arts and Sciences, S.I., N.Y.

\*Alexander B. Lyon, Jr., Vice President of Corporation Trust Dept. of Chemical Bank, N.Y.; Treasurer of ARBC.

\*Rabbi I. Usher Kirshblum, Jewish Center of Kew Gdns. Hills & Vice Pres. of Queens Interfaith Clergy Council; ARBC.

\*Edward Whitney, President, The Citizens Committee of Brooklyn, Inc., Brooklyn, N.Y.; ARBC.

\*Barry Goldwater, United States Senator, Arizona, United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

ARBC-Members of N.Y.C. American Revolution Bicentennial Citizens Committee.

Joseph J. Riche, Adjutant, Staten Island Detachment #1, Marine Corps League, Staten Island, NY.

\*Orval A. Taylor, Lt. Colonel, Commander, Greater N.Y. Unified Command, The Salvation Army, NY.

Peter Holowecki, Commander, The American Legion, Williston Post #144, Williston Park, LI, NY.

John P. Tipping, County Commander, The American Legion, Nassau County, Long Island, New York.

\*Stanley K. Hathaway, Governor, State of Wyoming, Executive Department, Cheyenne, Wyoming.

\*Jacob K. Javits, United States Senator, New York, United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

\*Ralph G. Caso, Nassau County Executive, Mineola, N.Y.; Chairman of Metropolitan Regional Council.

\*Robert B. Docking, Governor, State of Kansas, Office of the Governor, Topeka, Kansas.

Neil G. Knowles, National Commander, Catholic War Veterans of USA, Natl. Hdqrs., Washington, D.C.

\*Dr. Joseph J. Palisi, Borough Historian of Brooklyn, Borough Hall, Brooklyn, New York.

Joseph Jasty, Department Commander, AMVETS Department of New York, Hamburg, New York.

Donald R. Sloane, President, Sons of the Revolution in State of New York, Fraunces Tavern Museum, NYC.

Amadeo F. Rodriguez, Commandant, Greater N.Y. Detachment #1, Marine Corps League, New York County.

Gordon V. Greve, Commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart of USA, Greater N.Y. Chapter 126.

Dorothy Fooks, National Commander, Women World War Veterans, Inc.—Army, Navy, Marines, Coast Guard, Air Force.

\*\*Abraham D. Beame, Mayor of the City of New York, Office of the Mayor, City Hall, New York City.

Elliott S. Farbstein, Commander, The American Legion, East Side Post 868, New York, New York.

\*Bruce King, Governor, State of New Mexico, Office of the Governor, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

M. H. Wiggins, Regent, Natl. Society, Daughters of Amer. Revolution, Major Thomas Wickes Chap., Douglaston, NY.

\*John R. Ray, Director, Nassau County Veterans Service Agency, Carle Place, New York.

\*\*George C. Wallace, Governor, State of Alabama, Governor's Office, Montgomery, Alabama.

\*Honored Committee Members.

\*\*Honorary Committee Members.

#### BUSING—A LOCAL OPTION FOR QUALITY EDUCATION

### HON. RICHARD F. VANDER VEEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. VANDER VEEN. Mr. Speaker, busing should neither be prohibited in nor forced upon local communities by the U.S. Congress in the pursuit of equalizing educational opportunities for all children. It is not the answer to the larger problem of raising the economic status of minorities and inner city neighborhoods, a condition precedent to improved education.

I am in favor of local solutions to the problem of providing equal educational opportunities for all children. In some areas and under some circumstances, school systems may choose to use busing in pursuit of educational excellence, while in other places and other situations, busing may be wholly inappropriate. I am against a legislative prohibition of busing because it reduces flexibility at the local level. I am equally against a congressional requirement of busing for the same reason. I believe that the use of busing should be an option available to, but not forced upon, local communities.

Furthermore, our democratic process rests upon a vigorous checks and balances system which has always included a strong and independent judicial branch. In our system it is the responsibility of the courts to interpret the Constitution, and for the Congress to involve itself in this process by telling the courts what they cannot do is clearly uncon-

stitutional. If the Congress wishes to abolish busing, then under our Constitution the only way this can be done is through a constitutional amendment.

I am opposed to the Esch amendment to the ESEA because it is unconstitutional and even if it were not, it takes away from each school district the necessary flexibility needed to obtain educational excellence for our students. We must not lose sight of the fact that the critical issue is educational excellence for all of our children. As the Grand Rapids Press stated in an April 15 editorial:

The first [point to be stressed] is that busing is one of those semi-spurious issues which is debated and thrust before the public not so much to solve a problem as it is to trip up or embarrass a political opponent. Such issues . . . are guaranteed to excite emotions to such an extent that a lawmaker who feels compelled to cling to what he considers high principle or constitutional theory sometimes finds himself in the minority and is buried by popular opinion.

#### AMERICAN JOBS AND RHODESIAN CHROME

### HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, our country has been faced with critical shortages of vital materials needed for American industry. We need to be alert to any present shortages and any shortages which may develop in the future. This has been one of the major reasons why I have been concerned with the attempt of some Members of Congress to have the United States impose an embargo again on Rhodesian chrome. As we all know, Rhodesian chrome is vital to the production of specialty steel products—especially stainless steel. If we reestablish this embargo, it would seriously harm a critical industry in the United States and it would result in the loss of jobs for the American worker.

My recent concern has been with the attempts of proponents of this embargo to rely on inaccurate and misleading information in order to promote their case. An example of this type of distortion appeared in the April 7, 1974, issue of Steel Labor, a magazine of the United Steelworkers of America. This article was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 30, 1974 (16932-16934). The article claims that Rhodesian chrome caused a reduction of American jobs and that proponents of importing Rhodesian chrome have large financial interests in Rhodesia. Both of these charges are inaccurate. The article from Steel Labor states:

The pressure of low-cost imports of ferrochrome from Rhodesia began to be felt only months after passage of the Byrd Amendment, which "sanctioned" the U.S. to violate our international obligations and deal with the rump government created by Rhodesian racists. Today seven USWA locals who once employed 2,800 workers in four companies in Ohio, West Virginia, South Carolina and Alabama now have a work force almost

30 per cent smaller—directly attributed to ferrochrome imports of which Rhodesia is the largest source.

The facts reveal that the very opposite has been the case. During the period the United States had its embargo on Rhodesian chrome (1966-1971), U.S. ferrochrome production decreased steadily. It was only after the United States lifted this embargo that Rhodesian chromite became available to the American ferrochrome industry again, production increased dramatically. It was in 1973 that U.S. ferrochrome producers regained most of the ground they had lost during the embargo period. The real problem regarding a loss of jobs was due to the imposition of the embargo and not the repeal of the embargo. In fact, a reimposition of this embargo would cause a job loss for the American worker.

The article also stated:

When dealing with Members of Congress, company spokesmen never documented possible job loss due to any adherence to the Rhodesian boycott.

The opposite has been true. Steel company spokesmen and members of the United Steelworkers Union have provided facts and figures time and time again on the impact of the embargo on jobs. A strong and effective case has been made by concerned steelworkers and company representatives that repeal of the Byrd amendment with the reimposition of the boycott would have disastrous consequences for the specialty steel industry.

Another distortion which occurs in the article concerns financial interests of certain companies. It states:

Union Carbide and Foote Mineral are not coincidentally the most prominent lobbyists for Rhodesia—for they have multimillion dollar investments in that country and seek to protect their holdings.

An examination of the record reveals that Union Carbide has not had operational control of any Rhodesian facilities for more than 7 years and receives no income from Rhodesian sources while Foote Mineral Corp. does not own any property in Rhodesia.

The need for Rhodesian chrome for the specialty steel industry is vital. I respectfully suggest that the opponents of the Byrd amendment take time to review their statements for accuracy before they put them forth as part of the debate on this vital issue.

#### WHERE DOES IT HURT?

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the state of health care is one of the most important social issues facing the Nation today. Americans are spending \$94.1 billion a year on health care—\$441 for each man, woman, and child—yet this Nation ranks worse than 11 other countries in life expectancy and 26 nations in infant mortality. The only category in which we rank first is cost. Americans pay more per person for health care than

citizens of any other industrialized nation.

There is no conceivable reason why the wealthiest, most technically and scientifically advanced nation on Earth cannot also be the healthiest.

Nearly everyone agrees that "something ought to be done." With the addition of President Nixon's proposal Congress has accumulated for consideration 48 separate "health reform" bills.

The New Leader recently devoted an entire issue to the medical crisis in America. Titled "Where Does it Hurt?" the report was written by Richard J. Margolis.

I commend this issue to all my colleagues and will insert portions of it in the *Record* this week.

The first excerpt, "The Politics of Health Reform," compares the principal competing health reform bills now before the Congress: The Health Security Act (H.R. 22), the Long-Ribicoff catastrophic insurance proposal, the Kennedy-Mills bill, and the administration plan.

The article follows:

#### THE POLITICS OF HEALTH REFORM

No one in Washington nowadays, except for an occasional AMA lobbyist, worries about Federal intrusions into our private health care system. It is at least eight years and \$80 billion too late for such misgivings. What many people do worry about, and endlessly debate, is the precise nature of future Federal involvement: How much will it cost, who will pay for it and what groups, ultimately, will benefit?

In addition, there is much fretting over the question of control, because everybody in Washington knows that having a hand on the administrative steering wheel often entitles one to have the other hand in the Federal pocketbook. Thus, the desks of our Congressmen, and maybe their wastebaskets as well, are overflowing with measures that purport to have the right answers. Most of these schemes will die in committee; a privileged few, though not invariably the worthiest, will reach the floor of Congress.

What is a good, comprehensive health care proposal? No one is certain—at least no one ought to be—but there is little mystery about the goals toward which any sensible bill should point. These include: (1) full insurance coverage opportunities for every American; (2) a reasonable price tag, equitably shared; (3) more primary care physicians and fewer surgeons; (4) guarantees of health care when and where the patient needs it—at night and on weekends, in ghettos and in rural areas; (5) a shift of emphasis from hospital-sponsored crisis medicine to preventive medicine; and (6) a strong, continuing consumer voice in health care arrangements and policies.

Self-evident as such goals may be, not all the principal disputants can agree even on these; and when the debate shifts from goals to ways and means, the citizen's ear is assailed by a Babel of tongues. Every bill has its lobby, and every major lobby has its pet bill.

There now are about 600 registered health care lobbyists in Washington, more than half of whom work for the insurance industry. The growth of the insurance presence since Truman's time is proof of the proposition that today's vested interests are the products of yesterday's inadequate reforms. Unlike the AMA, which is forever emoting and verging on tantrum politics, the insurance lobby keeps a low profile. "They're very smooth, and they have a lot of money," says Allen Zack of the AFL-CIO. "It was mainly the insurance people and not the AMA who won all those concessions in Medicare and Medi-

caid. They've also got a lot of clout at HEW and the White House."

Insurance companies and their executives have been big Nixon contributors. Clement Stone, president of Combined Insurance, topped the list in 1972 with a \$2 million gift to the Committee to Reelect the President. Nixon has shown his appreciation in the kinds of health reforms he has proposed to Congress and in the way his HEW administrators have conducted their end of the health care business. HEW, as we demonstrated earlier, has suppressed its own auditors' reports of Medicare and Medicaid abuses by "fiscal intermediaries." It has also displayed a reluctance to air data that might make the commercial insurance industry look bad.

Not long ago Blue Cross sent out a news release based on an HEW research study showing how its customers got back in benefits a higher percentage of their premiums than did commercial insurance customers (*Social Security Bulletin*, February 1973). The very next day Blue Cross' information director, Joseph S. Nagelschmidt, received a call from an HEW official asking him to withdraw the release. According to Nagelschmidt, the official claimed to be acting on instructions from the White House. "They got a complaint from Clement Stone," Nagelschmidt says he was told. The release was withdrawn.

The nation's second most effective health care lobby is the AMA. Its political arm, the American Medical Political Action Committee (AMPAC), spent more than \$3 million on Congressional elections in 1972, distributing largesse to all candidates willing to sponsor "Medicredit," the AMA-backed bill that was submitted to Congress in 1970. The measure at present has more than 180 sponsors, including a sprinkling of northern Democrats.

Money accounts for much but not all of the AMA's political effectiveness. The association enjoys an inner strength as well because it believes its own mythology. While the rest of us despair of discovering a sensible path through the health care maze, the AMA remains serenely certain it knows the right answers. Yet it is risky to present an AMA official with a fact; you may put him out of sorts.

At a hearing before Senator Edward M. Kennedy's subcommittee two years ago, four AMA spokesmen denied there was a health care crisis. Even the President had said there was a "crisis," responded Kennedy, who went on to point out that the number of tonsillectomies in California was four times the national rate, suggesting that the distribution of surgeons around the country might be uneven. "Where does that statistic come from?" asked Harry Peterson, the AMA's chief lobbyist. The Senator replied that the figure was part of the Nixon health message. He then asked about the high rate of infant mortality in the U.S. Weren't there a dozen or so nations with lower rates? "Those figures are wrong!", cried Dr. Max Parrott, chairman of the AMA Board of Trustees. "They are absolutely wrong. They are used dishonestly." The statistics came from the United Nations.

This spectacle of a temperamental giant flailing in the dark would merely be funny if the AMA was not so adept at keeping the rest of us in the dark, too. Each week, for example, about 40 million Americans watch the television series, *Marcus Welby, M.D.*, a portrayal of fee-for-service Nirvana whose wise, kind and handsome protagonist is the very model of a model general practitioner. The AMA serves as a technical consultant to the program, and last fall reporters learned that it was instrumental in having two scenes from a single show left on the cutting room floor.

In the expurgated scenes a surgeon, Dr. Jeliff, remarked to Welby that 80 per cent of

the cost of an operation he had scheduled the next day would be paid by the patient's group medical insurance. Welby asked if that "isn't true in most of your cases?" Jeliff replied, "No. I'm sorry to say many of those who need insurance the most don't have it." Questioned about the cuts, the producers conceded that certain changes had been made "during editing."

Besides the AMA and the private insurance industry, lobbies like Blue Cross and the American Hospital Association (AHA) carry some weight on the Hill, though Blue Cross observes a nominal neutrality toward bills under consideration. ("We support certain principles," says George Kelley, its chief lobbyist, "but we don't take stands on legislation.") Since the health care community is a loose coalition of interest groups, each scrambling for the dollar, the lobbying organizations do not always agree. For instance, during last fall's Congressional debate over the Emergency Medical Service bill, a measure that would have pumped Federal funds into hospital emergency units if the President had not vetoed it, the AHA found itself arrayed against the AMA. (The AMA won when the House, by four votes, failed to override the veto.)

Nevertheless, at this stage of the game the private lobbies recognize that they have much in common and frequently they synchronize their ad hoc campaigns. Late last year, all the big-letter lobbies—AHA, HIAA and AHA—got together in strategy sessions intended to make the impending HMO bill conform more nearly to their interests. Among other things, they agreed to press for "dual choice," a provision putting private insurance plans on at least an equal competitive footing with HMOs (at the same time, they opposed requiring employers to include HMOs in the choice of insurance packages offered to employees). Blue Cross representatives attended some of these sessions, despite their insistence that they could take no position on proposed legislation.

#### THE LIBERAL LOBBY

The lobbying scales are thus tipped heavily on the side of private interest groups. The only counterweight of any note is the AFL-CIO and its embattled offspring, the Committee for National Health Insurance (CNHI), which is also called "The Committee of 100." On its roster can be found such distinguished names as Arthur Goldberg, John Kenneth Galbraith, Dr. Charles H. Mayo II, and Mrs. Martin Luther King Jr., plus a curious trio of former Senators—Paul H. Douglas, Ralph W. Yarborough and William B. Saxbe. In philosophy and spirit the committee is the natural descendant of two organizations mentioned earlier for their attempts to bring about enactment of universal national health insurance, the American Association of Labor Legislation (1912) and the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care (1927-32). The continuity is more than symbolic: Among the "100" is I. S. Falk, a CCMC founder who sought to get national health insurance written into the New Deal's Social Security Act.

CNHI is working in support of the "Health Security" program, S. 3, introduced four years ago by Senator Kennedy and Congresswoman Martha W. Griffiths (D-Mich.). Although Kennedy on April 2 announced he was joining in a substitute bill, S. 2 remains a touchstone for all those who view themselves as keepers of the 60-year-old dream of universal health insurance.

Most of the other bills are narrow-gauge proposals calling for new institutional subsidies, while permitting the overall system to lurch forward unattended and unaltered. To begin with, there is *Medicredit*, a gimmick the AMA whipped up in 1968 and has wistfully promoted ever since, with the help of that tireless champion of social reform, Senator Vance Hartke (D-Ind.). It would leave fee-for-service practice unscathed, and pro-

vide every possible incentive for doctors, hospitals and insurers to raise their rates.

In brief, Mediredit would distribute health insurance vouchers to all citizens, in amounts varying in inverse proportion to the size of their income tax bills—the less one pays, the more vouchers one receives. Theoretically, the poor would gain the most from this arrangement, but it would also reward millionaires like J. Paul Getty who by slipping through loopholes each year manage to pay little or no taxes. Most important, the plan would be virtually useless to a majority of middle-income Americans, because their tax bracket would render them ineligible for more than a token quantity of vouchers.

Few people in Washington take this proposal seriously. One must wonder whether many of the Congressmen who signed this bill did so out of conviction or out of gratitude to AMPAC. Even the commercial insurers, who stand to benefit from the measure—in effect, it would convert Federal agents into insurance salesmen and underwriters—prefer to ignore Mediredit and concentrate instead on the industry's own entry, the "National Health Care Act," introduced a year ago by Senator Thomas J. McIntyre (D.-N.H.).

"Healthcare," rhapsodizes a recent Health Insurance Association of America pamphlet, "seeks to contain health costs, improve organization and delivery of health services, and make comprehensive health insurance—including a \$250,000 catastrophe benefit—available to all. Under Healthcare no family need ever impoverish itself because of ill health." All this is to be accomplished through a complex system of state and Federal subsidies to insurance companies (HIAA graciously includes the "Blues" in its patronage plans) that would enable insurers to offer more benefits to more Americans, even the "high risks." This is the industry's latest attempt to persuade taxpayers to underwrite "clunkers."

In fairness, Healthcare does make a casual stab at revising the system, and that puts it light years ahead of Mediredit. For example, the plan would set up minimum Federal standards for benefits, which might widen coverage beyond hospitalization and raise the ceiling on "catastrophic" insurance, but it lacks specific machinery to enforce these guidelines. Healthcare does recommend machinery to review charges submitted by health care providers under Federal programs, yet the review powers are to be vested not in Washington but in 50 separate "State Healthcare Institutions Cost Commissions" to be appointed by the governors. Both the notion and the name are so awkward that a hospital might double its charges before anyone in a state capitol could find tongue or title.

The AHA favorite—the National Health Care Services Reorganization and Financing Act (H.R. 1)—is not thought to have much chance of passing either. The bill, introduced by Congressman Al Ullman (D.-Ore.), is better than most, albeit Byzantine in structure. It mandates creation of a network of local health care corporations to which citizens may subscribe in advance for services. "All persons," Ullman has said, "... would be entitled to the same broad package of benefits," with employers paying three-fourths of the cost for their workers, and the Federal government picking up the tab for the poor and the elderly.

Apparently these corporations could function as HMOs, though the wording on that score is not entirely clear. What is clear is that hospitals would play a central role in this system, since in most places they are the only institutions capable of administering so complicated a plan. The hospitals, in turn, would be regulated by state health commissions appointed by the governors—an unpromising arrangement, to judge from the

Medicaid experience, where so many states have failed to enforce sensible standards of quality and cost.

The strength of Ullman's bill lies in its attempt to "rationalize" the health care system rather than merely subsidize it, and in its provision for a new Cabinet-level Department of Health to preside over the entire mélange. Yet for all its detailed exegesis—the measure, in close type, fills 34 pages of the *Congressional Record*—H.R. 1 remains distressingly vague about who will control what. One is left with the impression that the hospitals will be in charge, and that these state health commissions will represent institutions instead of consumers.

#### VIABLE PROPOSALS

Perhaps what weighs most heavily against Mediredit, Healthcare and H.R. 1 is that none is a "politically viable proposal." A politically viable proposal is one made by the President, or else sponsored by somebody on the Hill capable of getting it on the agenda of an appropriate committee. In the Senate, the man to watch is Russell B. Long (D.-La.), chairman of the Finance Committee. And sure enough, his committee is slated to consider a new health bill—drawn up in collaboration with former HEW Secretary Abraham Ribicoff (D.-Conn.)—the Long-Ribicoff Catastrophic Health Insurance and Medical Assistance Reform Act.

Before Nixon introduced his latest health plan, the Long-Ribicoff bill enjoyed considerable support among reformers on the Hill. The names of its sponsors—such lustrous liberals as Senators Gaylord Nelson (D.-Wis.), James Abourezk (D.-S.D.), George McGovern (D.-S.D.), and Quentin Burdick (D.-N.D.)—remain on the measure, but their ardor has cooled somewhat in the face of the President's program. For to the embarrassment of these Senators, the Administration's proposal actually offers more health insurance coverage to the public than does the "liberal" Long-Ribicoff package. As a result, Chairman Long will probably feel compelled to hold hearings later this spring that will also take up the President's bill, sponsored by Senator Robert Packwood (R.-Ore.) and Congressman Herman Schneebeli (R.-Pa.).

In the House, the man who counts most is Wilbur D. Mills (D.-Ark.), chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. And sure enough, he has in hand a freshly minted bill sponsored by himself and Senator Kennedy for which he has scheduled hearings to begin after the Easter recess. "I think the bill has a good chance of passing this year," Mills said at a recent press conference.

The Kennedy-Griffiths proposal, therefore, remains just a gleam in the CNHI. Since it has been abandoned by one of its authors, what little chance it had of passing this year is completely gone. For liberals, this raises difficult tactical questions: Should they, like Kennedy, give up on S. 3 and settle for half a loaf from Mills, Nixon, or Long? Or should they hold out for their own full loaf and thereby risk—indeed, guarantee—getting nothing this session? Before exploring this dilemma, we ought first to compare the three competing bills in the light of those six basic goals listed earlier.

1. Full insurance coverage opportunities for every American. Under Kennedy-Griffiths everyone is eligible for benefits that cover the entire range of health services. There are no means tests and no strings—no deductibles, no coinsurance clauses, no limits on preventive care.

The other three bills offer protection to nearly every American, too, but the extent depends upon age and income. They would keep Medicare, replace Medicaid and introduce plans for the heretofore neglected middle class. In general, they would pay some benefits to some of the people some of the time. Long-Ribicoff emphasizes catastrophic insurance, for which 95 per cent of the popu-

lation is eligible, and a Federal subsidy system for the poor; Kennedy-Mills and Nixon both proposed benefits for the middle class—the former through a compulsory Federal plan, the latter through voluntary private insurance plans.

The President's employee group package carries a \$150 deductible on out-patient drugs. Further, a family must pay one-fourth of all charges, up to \$1,500 each year. Such "copayments" are also a feature of Long-Ribicoff and Kennedy-Mills. Long-Ribicoff would charge a middle-income patient \$17.50 for each day of hospitalization and 20 per cent of all medical bills (up to \$1,000)—after the patient has absorbed the first \$2,000 of medical expenses and 60 days' worth of hospital costs. Under Kennedy-Mills, the patient would pay a \$150 deductible and then one-fourth of the total medical bill up to \$1,000 per family per year. However, preventive care like prenatal examinations and family planning would get "first-dollar coverage" (no deductibles or copayments).

2. A reasonable price tag, equitably shared. S. 3 is the most expensive—\$67 billion. The program envisions a Health Security Trust Fund fed by a Social Security tax of 3.5 per cent on employers, and 1 per cent on the first \$15,000 of a worker's annual wages. This money would be supplemented by Federal general revenues.

Kennedy-Mills supporters say their measure would cost \$40 billion a year, the funds to be raised along S. 3 lines. The slight difference is that a minimum of 3 per cent would be charged to employers and a maximum of 1 per cent to workers.

A similar price of \$40 billion is estimated for the Nixon proposal, though the Administration claims it would require only \$13 billion a year from the Federal treasury. That is because the White House is relying largely on private insurance coverage privately financed—by employers and employees—and as the New York Times has observed, "Mr. Nixon's premiums must be paid just as if they were called taxes." Worse, it treats as taxable income for individuals the premium contributions made by employers, and then turns around and treats employee contributions as nondeductible expenses. The tax-paying worker is thus put in double jeopardy.

By contrast, Long-Ribicoff backers claim their bill would cost about \$10 billion. It adds only 0.3 per cent to the Social Security tax, the burden to be shared by employers and employees, yet its system of co-payments and deductibles constitutes cruel (though not unusual) punishment of the poor, and in effect forces low-income families to subsidize the Federal program. Under its replacement for Medicaid, a family of four earning \$6,000 a year would have to spend \$1,200 on health care before becoming eligible for spotty and incomplete Long-Ribicoff assistance.

The real dollar difference between Kennedy-Griffiths and the other three proposals can be found not in their total cost estimates, which are in any case likely to change as the debate progresses, but in their varying approaches to cost control. There is nothing in the other programs to suggest that the upward spiral of health care prices will be checked. All three plans retain Medicare, the chief inflationary villain of the past decade. Kennedy-Mills further repeats the Medicare mistake of designating insurance companies "fiscal intermediaries," thus virtually guaranteeing an open season on prices.

Kennedy-Griffiths, on the other hand, has provisions for long-range budgeting procedures, region by region, that may compel hospitals and physicians to set their prices in advance and stick to them. Only institutions meeting Federal standards of cost and quality will be allowed to participate in the program, and wasteful duplication of services is gradually to be eliminated

through threatened withdrawal of Federal funding. Such measures, it is true, hardly guarantee effective cost controls, but they point in the right direction, while the other three bills simply feed the inflationary monster.

3,4,5. More "primary care" physicians and fewer surgeons; guarantees of health care when and where the patient needs it; and a shift of emphasis from hospital-sponsored crisis medicine to preventive medicine. Long-Ribicoff and Nixon are silent on all these issues. The Kennedy-Mills bill calls for planning grants that may help small towns to attract medical workers and facilities, and it gives financing preference to HMOs as well as to other forms of group medicine. None of its provisions, though, measures up to those in Kennedy-Griffiths. That includes a "manpower support" program for the training of primary care physicians and of other types of health care generalists (public health nurses, community health workers, etc.).

It also offers financial incentives to doctors and health workers prepared to work in ghettos and rural areas, and imposes "disincentives" for the disproportionate clustering of doctors in affluent neighborhoods.

In addition, by spreading and in some measure equalizing purchasing power for health care, Kennedy-Griffiths gives Harlem and Appalachia a chance to compete for doctors with Scarsdale and Gramercy Park. Finally, the Health Security bill is the only one of the three to offer special subsidies to HMOs, encouraging the practice of preventive medicine and of comprehensive, 24-hour health care.

6. A strong, continuing consumer voice in health care arrangements and policies. This is another area where Nixon, Long-Ribicoff and Kennedy-Mills are largely silent. The groups that would oversee the Kennedy-Mills planning grants, it is true, are to have a majority of consumer members; but the makeup of the three-man "Social Security Board" that would run the national program is not specified, and a spokesman for the bill has said off the record that it is not likely to include consumers.

The Kennedy-Griffiths measure does pay lip service to consumer participation, but nothing in the proposal spells out how the consumer's voice is to be heard over the institutional chorus. The faint hope here is something called a "National Advisory Council," which is to have a majority of consumer representatives.

In sum, then, while Kennedy-Griffiths is less than perfect, it outscored the others on nearly all counts. In a single administrative package it offers universal coverage, full benefits, sensible cost controls and a variety of devices designed gradually to reshape our health care system—to redistribute manpower, establish more HMOs and encourage preventive medicine. It is therefore the only measure now in the hopper that begins to correct the historic despoliations of fee-for-service medicine and to break up the thriving but unwholesome trade triangle of physicians, hospitals and insurers.

#### PROSPECTS

CNHI officials, in pondering whether to "go for broke" this year with Kennedy-Griffiths or to support the passage of one or another weaker measure, would like most of all to delay a decision on this question. "We don't have enough votes in this Congress," explains Max Fine, the CNHI's director. "So we're hoping there'll be no action in '74. Then we can make health reform an issue in the November campaigns and come back with a Medicare-type mandate"—that is, with an overwhelmingly liberal majority of the kind that rammed home Medicare in 1965. The strategy will strike some as cynical. After all, even Nixon's program would afford at least some succor to millions of Americans not now protected. Surely any plan that re-

duces the incidence of family bankruptcies can't be all bad.

And yet, as we have seen, the history of health care reform is strewn with compromises that have tended to shore up the system without necessarily making things easier for the patient, and each new compromise has spawned new lobbies determined to delay fundamental reform. Are we, then, in retribution for past failures and current casuistries, condemned to play Sisyphus forever? Or can we find a way to break the old pattern—those long uphill struggles, those painful downhill slides—and at last attain the top (or at least a reasonable height)? The question will doubtless be answered by the American voter, a frequently confused citizen, careless of distinctions and neglectful of his own interests.

At bottom, the prospects for health care reform depend upon our ability to mobilize the democratic process in the service of institutional change. That is an old challenge in America, going back at least as far as Andrew Jackson, who regretted "that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their selfish purposes." But it has a particular urgency today in Washington, where private lobbies make public policy, and where government is more that ever an instrument of corporate plunder.

Some of the signs suggest that the American voter may be prepared to act, if he can find a leader. Never before have so many citizens mistrusted the health care system and its friends; never before have the lobbies been forced to run so hard simply to stay in one place; and never before has there been such broad agreement on the need for strenuous Federal action.

When word filtered back to North Dakota that Senator Burdick had affixed his name to the Long-Ribicoff bill, the Farmers' Union sent him 5,000 protesting telegrams. The Senator was stunned. "I didn't know they cared," he is reported to have said. Quite a few organizations are beginning to care. In recent months the CNHI has put together a coalition that embraces such groups as the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers, the United Methodist Church, the National Council of Senior Citizens, the Urban League, Common Cause, the National Jewish Welfare Association, and the Mennonite Central Committee. Even the League of Women Voters is sending a representative to the meetings. "It's a massive lobbying effort," says a spokesman for the coalition. "We're telling our friends on the Hill that we'd rather have nothing than have a weak bill."

The coalition, informal and disorganized as it is, represents an entirely new stage in the country's long struggle for reform of the health care system. It is precisely what was missing in those earlier battles of 1912, 1934 and 1947. Curiously, in its efforts to put together a grass-roots health lobby the CNHI is being unwittingly assisted by Nixon, who for obvious political reasons of his own is now diligently pushing a health program in Congress. "Health reform," notes Susan Stoiber of CNHI, "is usually everybody's fourth or fifth concern. This year it may be number two."

For the public, the challenge is plain enough: There is the goal and there is the stone; it is everyone's turn to push.

#### GOLDEN DEEDS AWARD

### HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I know it will interest the Members of the Congress

who remember our great and good friend, D. R. (Billy) Matthews, to know that he has been named the recipient of the annual Golden Deeds Award of the Gainesville, Fla., Exchange Club.

The club selects one person annually for the award for contributions to the community and "responses to need that go beyond the call of duty."

Mr. Billy served in the U.S. Congress from 1952 to 1967 and prior to that time, he served in the State legislature.

Since leaving the Congress, he has been a professor of political science and social studies at Santa Fe Community College in Gainesville.

I saw him recently and can relate to my colleagues that he is in good health, good spirits, is enjoying life to the fullest, and continues to make a tremendous contribution to mankind.

He is my friend and I am proud of that fact.

MICHAEL RELIS HONORED

### HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, there appeared last week in the Detroit Free Press, an item which relates how Michael Relis, a native of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., in my congressional district, was decorated by Jordan for his outstanding work there for 2 years as director of CARE. I believe this honor merits the attention of my colleagues, both for the distinction of the award, and for the fine expression of sentiment which was given along with it. The article follows:

MIDEAST-STYLE GRATITUDE HEAPED ON SOO NATIVE

Highly unlikely that a native of the Soo in the Upper Peninsula of Our State should earn the right to be addressed as Excellency in Jordan, or, for that matter, anywhere else he cares to present the credentials that came to him by way of King Hussein.

After serving as director of CARE for two years in Jordan, Michael Relis is now on his way to a similar post in Vietnam. He is entitled to wear the Independence of Jordan Grade II decoration presented to him by Dr. Younis Dihni, minister of social affairs.

The decoration is fine, but Relis treasures even more this wonderfully warm note in Arabic from Sheikh Nimer Oudeh, "a notable of Al Taamreh in Bethlehem District."

Translated, it reads: "I would like here to thank you very much for your deeds while you are the Director of the Organization in Jordan."

"I thank you for the humanity that you offered all the refugees and all those who need help in Jordan, and here I admit that you are one of the best benevolent persons, because you suffered much during your work in our country, in doing the best you can and in offering your benevolence and kindness to everybody."

"I would like here to thank you and congratulate all the people in the United States because you are one of them, and you were known during your work here as an active, honorable and charitable person, so we will miss you when you leave us."

"We are thankful for everything you offered us with our children, and we are trustful that you will never forget us and try to help us even if you are far away of us."

"Our best regards and I wish you all the happiness, and ask God to keep you always in good health, and give you whatever you need."

# AN OPEN LETTER TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Open Letter to the American People," written by one of my constituents, Dr. Joseph D. Casolaro, an outstanding physician in my congressional district. I feel his views in this matter should be of interest to my colleagues and the American people.

The article follows:

## AN OPEN LETTER TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

I do not justify the Watergate burglary; nor the buying of ambassadorships; nor the acceptance of money from corporations expecting favors in return; nor the use of IRS to audit returns of political enemies; nor of many other acts of political expedience.

Nor do I justify freeing Daniel Ellsberg; or redeeming Alger Hiss; or condoning the Rosenbergs; or supporting Fidel Castro; or the assassination of President Diem; or suppressing aid to South Vietnam; or opposing the bombing of Cambodia; or complaining about the money spent in making rain over the Ho Chi Minh trail.

There are, however, in our midst, those who would make high crimes of the alleged acts of "the President's men", and justify the perversities of ideological and actual treason, in the name and guise of civil liberty and the new morality.

Wake up, America! This coalition of free thinkers, angry dissidents, well intended Pharisees, self serving politicians, and Kremlin "engineers" are directing the fickle crowd to tell America to take off the old morality and put on the new.

Compare with me, the old and the new morality:

The old morality verbalizes the deleted expletive; the new morality does it, with consenting adults, of course.

The old morality dies for its country; the new morality objects, conscientiously, of course.

The old morality salutes the flag; the new morality steps on it, perhaps even burns it.

The old morality respects; the new morality disdains.

The old morality looks clean; the new morality looks dirty.

The old morality gives; the new morality takes.

The old morality forbears; the new morality complains.

The old morality works; the new morality loafs.

The old morality believes; the new morality rejects.

The old morality makes mistakes; the new morality is never wrong.

The old morality has saints and sinners; the new morality has only saints.

Listen, America! Our country is on trial. None of the alleged acts of political expedience are crimes of serious enough nature to emasculate the President, who has been tried

and convicted by a mob of Americans who know not what they do.

Turn on the light, America! You're being raped by wolves wearing the cloak of the new morality.

Get tough, America! They'll run, because they're cowards.

Memorial Day/May 30, 1974; with a pledge that I serve no political party or cause.

JOSEPH D. CASOLARO, M.D.

ARLINGTON, VA.

## CONGRESSIONAL DEMOCRATS' POLICY VACUUM

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. Speaker, an article by David W. Secrest entitled, "Congressional Democrats' Policy Vacuum," appeared in the May 31 edition of the New York Times.

We have heard a great deal in recent weeks about a "veto-proof Congress" in 1975, about "congressional dictatorship," and about a rebirth of the legislative branch of Government. Such prospects are generally received with rejoicing on my side of the aisle—and gloom on the other.

But what have we, as Democrats, done over the past decade, or more, to demonstrate an ability to lead this Nation through the difficult days ahead; what even have we done in the last 12 months despite nearly unprecedented national problems?

What planning are we now undertaking; what new policies are we now developing; what new leaders are we putting forth to provide this Nation with the kind of leadership it has a right to expect?

Ask yourself, as I have asked myself, and you may find considerable wisdom in Mr. Secrest's column—and then, perhaps, we had better take his admonition seriously and start thinking in bigger terms.

The text of Mr. Secrest's column follows:

[From the New York Times, May 31, 1974]

## CONGRESSIONAL DEMOCRATS' POLICY VACUUM

(By David W. Secrest)

WASHINGTON.—Republicans are sounding alarms about a vetoproof Congress, and the Democrats may indeed win the two-to-one House margin they are hoping for in November if things keep up the way they are. But whether they would know what to do with it is something else. If present performance is any indication, there is no reason to think that policymaking will shift from the White House to Capitol Hill.

The Democrats would no doubt have an easier time passing some bills like a big health-insurance package. But there is only so much distance they could travel down Great Society Lane, given the inflation constraints that everyone would recognize. As for fashioning new answers to problems ailing the country, there is neither the capability nor the will among Congressional Democrats to do so.

In the five and a half years since the Democrats lost control of the White House, they have developed very little in the way

of either policy initiatives or real alternatives in such areas as the economy, welfare reform, housing, health care, or revitalization of the cities. A petition with 64 signatures gotten up by Representative Donald M. Fraser of Minnesota, which plaintively asks the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee to "draft a program to deal with the current economic crisis," symbolized the frustration of the rank and file over lack of leadership on issues.

There is no structure around the leadership that can even try to deal with problems as broad as the combination of stagnation and inflation, poverty, and reconciling energy needs with environmental needs. These issues cut across Congressional committee lines. They call for policy committees and study-and-action groups with direct lines to the leadership to pull the pieces together. Otherwise, Congress is just enacting a tax cut here while ending controls there, increasing food stamps with one hand while cutting low-cost housing with another.

It is symptomatic that Speaker Carl Albert has only two staff aides working on substantive issues. On policy questions he operates out of his hip pocket. The closest thing to a policy-development group supported by staff is the liberal Democratic Study Group—and that is organized outside the leadership and often in opposition to it.

The Senate Democrats do a little better, with Majority Leader Mike Mansfield leading real discussions of issues in the Democratic Policy Committee. The effort to preserve some kind of wage-price monitoring after controls ended came out of such a discussion.

But in the House, Democratic policymaking consists of the leaders taking whatever comes out of each committee, however fragmentary or inadequate, and stamping it "policy." The signs are that Mr. Albert chooses to keep it that way. If there were a real policy operation it would threaten the hegemony of committee chairmen, and that would not be his style. He did not become Speaker by being out in front on issues. He, like most others who emerge as legislative leaders in a coalition party made up of warring factions, got there by being a compromiser.

There is no certainty that any Speaker could exercise a leading policy voice, given the diversity of the party and the increasing democratization of the House. But most Democrats in Congress hunger for stronger leadership, and it's a shame the effort isn't really made. The leaders are too busy just taking care of daily business and putting out brush fires to devote much energy to high policy.

It doesn't have to be that way. Lyndon B. Johnson as Senate leader had a high-powered staff of fifteen doing solid work on issues. After the 1958 election, with a big new majority, he followed President Eisenhower's State of the Union address with one of his own.

House Republicans mounted a similar operation after the Johnson landslide of 1964. With their ranks decimated, they organized and staffed a dozen task forces and brought in outside experts. The task forces developed into position papers such concepts as revenue-sharing, lump-sum grants to give local government increases discretion in broad areas of spending, new approaches to law enforcement and manpower, and published a book on Congressional reform. When the Republicans captured the White House in 1968, they had policy programs ready. Even today, with their own party controlling the Administration, they maintain a well-staffed House policy operation.

If Democrats expect to step into the vacuum from a power base in Congress, their elected leaders had better start thinking in bigger terms.

# TRIBUTE TO JAMES A. FARLEY

## HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that my good friend James A. Farley has been awarded the 1974 Laetare Medal, the University of Notre Dame's highest honor. Mr. Farley's distinguished career has included his appointment by Franklin Roosevelt as Postmaster General of the United States, his designation as honorary chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., and his chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. Farley who is known to many as "Gentleman Jim," and "Genial Jim," has stood throughout his life, for all the values, spiritual and political, which have made America great. In politics and in business, in the home and in the church, Mr. Farley is truly an outstanding man.

I would like to submit the following material on Mr. Farley's award for the RECORD.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME TO  
HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

SIR: The strength and vitality of our country can be attributed in large measure to the genius of our political system, to the vigor of our free economy and, above all, to the spiritual values which we as a nation espouse. To a remarkable degree, in your life and your work, you, perhaps more than any other man of our time, symbolize our national commitment to these values and to the proposition that honorable competition, whether in politics or business, best serves the American people.

Who could foretell that the lad of twelve who stood trackside to hear Williams Jennings Bryan would become Chairman of the Democratic National Committee? Who would have predicted that the Town Clerk of Stony Point, New York, would become the mentor of the President of the United States and the Postmaster General in his Cabinet? Who could have foreseen that the young book-keeping student at Packard Commercial School would some day be Board Chairman of an American corporation operating in every corner of the world? Who, indeed, had the prescience to predict that this affable Irishman would become as familiar a figure at the Papal apartments as he was at the White House?

In retrospect, Sir, it is easier to see how your own character and Providence have combined to bring you to this day. Throughout your life, you have honored the God-given dignity of every man and woman, and because of this no American has more friends. Yours has been the world of precinct committeemen and prelates, of salesmen and presidents, but you have neither been awed by the powerful nor unmindful of the powerless. You have never forgotten your friends. Your opponents and competitors hold you in the highest regard.

In politics and in business, where it is often easier to do the expedient thing, you have been a man of principle. Without losing Franklin Roosevelt's friendship or lessening your allegiance to your political party, you opposed more than two four-year presidential terms because you believed such was not in the national interest. Today, when America's faith in its political institutions and person-

alities is challenged as never before, you stand as a beacon of integrity.

Your public life, as well as your business career, are on record for all to see. Not so well-known is your edifying private life which you cherished with your beloved Elizabeth, your son and daughters, and now with your grandchildren. The geniality, the courage, the compassion which we have admired at a distance have been theirs to cherish close up. Yours, Sir, is the special charisma of the Catholic layman. Your influence in secular society was great at a time when the impact of Catholics generally was small. A man of faith in a world of fact, born closer to the First Vatican Council than to Vatican Council II, you anticipated by several decades the role of the layman in a church which is ever old and yet ever new.

For what you have achieved, then, but even more for what you are, the University of Notre Dame presents to you its most prized symbol of esteem and affection. As we seek to honor you, you surely honor the Medal and the University in accepting it. For your lifelong dedication to your family, to your country, and to your Church, for the decency and integrity which you have always exemplified, for the leadership you have given in countless good causes, it is my honor, as President of the University of Notre Dame, to confer upon you its Laetare Medal.

## AMERICANS FOR SIMAS LETTER TO MEMBERS OF U.S. CONGRESS

### HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, I introduced a concurrent resolution regarding the Lithuanian seaman, Simas Kudirka. Since that time several events have occurred. "Americans for Simas" and "Seamen's Education Federation" wish to update the Congress on these events. For my colleagues' information, I submit the following letter:

AMERICANS FOR SIMAS AND  
SEAMEN'S EDUCATION FEDERATION,  
Middle Village, N.Y., June 1, 1974.

AN URGENT APPEAL TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE  
U.S. CONGRESS

On May 17th Mrs. Marija Kudirka Sulskiene was officially registered as an American citizen and issued a U.S. passport at the American embassy in Moscow. Mrs. Sulskiene is the mother of Simas Kudirka, the Lithuanian seaman, who was shamefully denied political asylum in this country in 1970 and returned to a Soviet ship to be subsequently sentenced to a 10 year term in a Soviet labor camp. Mrs. Sulskiene has expressed a desire to come to the U.S., but must yet obtain a Soviet exit visa, (NYT May 22, 1974).

Through his mother Simas Kudirka has derived a right to American citizenship. Since he was born out of wedlock in 1929 in the Republic of Lithuania, his case is covered by Section 205 of the Nationality Act approved October 14, 1940.

President Nixon's upcoming trip to the Soviet Union is being viewed by the world community as a reaffirmation of "détente" between the United States and the Soviet Union. True "détente" can prosper only in an atmosphere of balanced cooperation. If the Soviets desire concessions from us in fields such as trade, they should be prepared to

yield on certain issues of great concern to the average American. One of these issues is the release of American citizens in the USSR, who have expressed a desire to repatriate.

On Nov. 23, 1970 Simas Kudirka risked his life in an effort to reach American soil, when he leaped from a Soviet ship to the deck of the U.S. Coast Guard cutter "Vigilant". Though he may not have been fully aware of his rights at the time, his brave attempt to reach American territory is in itself one of the strongest applications for U.S. citizenship. A tragic mistake in judgment on the part of our government officials resulted in his present unjust imprisonment. Now more than ever our government's moral obligation is to rectify this grievous error.

The "Americans for Simas" committee, the "Seamen's Education Federation", and the "Lithuanian-American Community of the USA" as well as other organizations have appealed to President Nixon to bring up the Kudirka case during his summit talks with Soviet leader Leonid I. Brezhnev and request the release of Simas Kudirka, and allow him and his family to emigrate to the U.S.

We respectfully request all members of the U.S. Congress, who support our appeal, to contact the White House and convey their views to the President before his departure. A courageous man's freedom may depend on it.

## GALLAUDET COLLEGE HONORS CONGRESSMAN ALBERT H. QUIE

### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues will be pleased to learn that Gallaudet College for the Deaf, recently honored one of the outstanding champions in Congress of aid for the handicapped, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE, by awarding him the degree of doctor of laws at its May commencement.

Also receiving an honorary doctor of laws degree on this occasion was Craig Mills, director of the division of vocational rehabilitation of the State of Florida, and a past president of the State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Minnesota also delivered the commencement address at Gallaudet, and because I know it will be of interest to the Members of the House, I insert it at this point in the RECORD.

#### COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

(By Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE)

Thank you Mr. President, honored platform guests, graduates 1974, families, and friends.

Recently I saw this line in the newspaper: "President Nixon is the only head of a major Western, Democratic nation who has been in office longer than two and one-half months." With all the problems facing our nation which we read about constantly and hear about from the media, that sentence makes us realize that this nation is not the only one with problems. But when one thinks that the head of the nation of West Germany left office because of a spy serving under him, when we think that the government of our neighbor Canada toppled because of an economic crisis, we think of Great Britain whose government toppled and now the Labor government headed by Prime Minister Wilson is a minority govern-

ment, we think of the head of government of France passing away and just an election now to replace him, the Israeli nation not knowing exactly how its government will be made up, we can see the Western world is in turmoil.

#### ENERGY AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Our problems are not limited to a crisis in confidence over our government, however. We just finished a winter, and in the colder parts of our nation we wondered if there would be enough fuel to keep the people warm, energy to keep our business in operation. This crisis just followed a deep concern of the American people of whether we were polluting ourselves to where we could no longer live on this globe in the way we have been able to enjoy for more than two decades. Problems, nothing but problems. And you are wondering as graduates now when you leave, will there be a job available for you. Will we be going into a recession as a nation? What really does the future have in store for us?

One only has to think a little bit of history and realize that mankind has constantly had problems. Our forefathers left a nation where their needs could not be satisfied and came to this nation mostly to a life of privation at first and finally working themselves to the position where you and your parents are now.

#### THE SYSTEM IS WORKING

How did this all happen? It must be our economic and governmental system. And I can say to you that our system is working despite the fact that some individuals close to the President have been indicted, some convicted. The very fact people on top are being indicted and convicted shows our system is working. The fact that we do not feel as great a crisis of the need of energy now as we did during the winter shows our system is working. The fact that the American people are aware of their environmental needs and are making corrections shows that the system is working. One can take hope in the fact that as slow as it moves, the system is working. And therefore I ask you to face these future years with that hope—that the system is working.

Now if that is the case, how is the system working for the individual who is classified as handicapped—those of you who are considered deaf? For a long period of time any help for you was looked on as charity or a moral obligation, but that is changing. The system is working. Now it is becoming a matter of right for a person to receive an opportunity through education and training to develop to their full potential. First, state laws began to be enacted. Later the Federal Government became involved and as each year passes, the legislation provides just a little bit more help.

The most significant of all help for the handicapped, however, has been recent decisions by the courts. In Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia, the courts decreed it is a matter of right for any individual, handicapped or not, to be able through our education system to develop to their full potential.

What does that mean for you? That means that you no longer need to depend on someone else out of charity or a moral obligation to help you, but that you who do have a handicap of deafness, have a responsibility yourselves to make certain that all who share in that same handicap can avail themselves of the opportunity to develop to their full potential as you have had the opportunity as you attended Gallaudet College.

It is not possible for a person like myself to fully understand what it is like to be deaf. To me it is like a person on the Equator trying to understand what snow is like. I can come from Minnesota and tell them, but they can never fully understand snow until they come to Minnesota and see it—and feel

it. Therefore, I believe that there is a great challenge for you as you play a part in society with our system working with leadership in order that people might enjoy a life in which the pressures that now are witnessed in our society are no longer there.

#### EDUCATION NOT THE TOTAL ANSWER

Now that cannot come just from the system, even though I have assured you the system is working. Because it's interesting that the people who have had primary responsibility in the areas where our nation is faced with severe crises have been well educated individuals. The people in responsibility are college graduates. Some of the greatest educational institutions in our land have produced individuals who have caused many of the problems that have affected us.

Those implicated in recent wrongdoings in government are college graduates. Those who produced nuclear weapons that can devastate the entire globe graduated from our most prestigious institutions. Also the ones who produced the technology that could leave us in a polluted state. Well-educated people increased demands to the extent that we do not have enough energy to fulfill those demands. So what is the answer? More education? That's not the total answer.

#### FAITH THE PURPOSE OF LIFE

What is the total answer? The answer comes from people's ability to live in grace with their fellowman. Now there was a person who lived on this earth, who lived a life of love, who was a pattern and an example for people who came after Him. Now it is practically 2,000 years since He lived on this earth. What did He teach us? He taught us to love each other. Now it's easy for us to understand that word "love" for anyone who shares a relationship with a person of the other sex. Most of the songs that we hear talk about that kind of love. It's easy to love each other if you have the same philosophy, the same politics, the same religion, or even share in the same handicap. But the most difficult task of all expressed by Jesus Christ was loving your enemy. As one develops the ability to love one's enemy as one's self, there comes the power that can enable people to live in grace with each other. We will never live in a utopia because we will never be intelligent enough to do it. We will never all be alike. We'll all be different. But in our differences God gave us an infinite worth and that worth can be developed to its full potential if we truly love God and each other. That is really the message that I would like to leave with you. It came to me with vivid realization in 1957 when I spoke to the graduating class at the Fairbault School for the Deaf when their motto was taken from Russian author Leo Tolstoy—"Faith is the purpose of life." And in that motto one can realize by studying the life of Tolstoy, his desire to try and find national renown, which he found—without satisfaction, wealth, which he received—without satisfaction. The acclaim and the wealth was not enough for him. So he looked around and saw the people who were happy were those who gave of themselves to other people—which he tried and it worked for awhile. Until finally in his later years he realized that faith—faith in his God—was what gave purpose to his life and that faith enables a person to love another human being even though that human being is different.

Let me remind you again. We'll always have differences of nationality and nations. We'll always have the racial differences. We'll always have the political differences. We'll worship our Almighty God in different ways. No matter how we integrate, we'll have the differences of the sexes. Then how can mankind with those differences live in grace with each other? Our Lord gave us the answer when he asked us to love the Lord with all our heart, with all our soul, with all our

mind, with all our strength, and our neighbor as ourselves.

I leave these last words with you for your thoughts and your meditation and with full understanding to make it a part of your life when Christ said, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life."

#### PSRO IS BAD MEDICINE

#### HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to hear of the recent action of the Texas doctors, through the Texas Medical Association, to take legal and legislative action against the professional standards review organizations. These PSRO's, adopted at part of the 1972 Social Security Amendments, establish a dangerous precedent—Government intrusion into the field of medicine. They must be repealed. The PSRO's are now limited to medicaid and medicare patients. If a national health care program is adopted, these PSRO's would be extended to every physician in the country. I wish to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Bad Medicine" from the May 27, 1974, edition of the Dallas Morning News on the action of the Texas doctors:

#### BAD MEDICINE

Texas doctors have made it official: They are going to fight against Professional Standards Review Organizations. Power to them, for PSROs, unknown as they are to the general public, are bureaucratic excrescences of really dangerous caliber.

They came into being with the 1972 Social Security amendments. Congress motive in creating them was simon-pure—to make sure doctors gave only "medically necessary" treatment to Medicare and Medicaid patients. To that end, Congress ordained that PSROs be set up on a regional basis by Jan. 1, 1974. After a 2-year trial run, the secretary of HEW will institutionalize them.

So far it all sounds removed from the normal concerns of taxpaying Americans. But the truth is otherwise. A PSRO is to consist of doctors; but lay groups may be designated to give advice. The committees will set standards for health care, prescribing what is appropriate treatment and what is not. All treatment must then accord with PSRO standards, or some hospital, some doctor is in a heap of trouble. Naturally, to police their standards, the PSROs may commandeer the medical histories of individual patients.

All this represents a disturbing use of government power, and never mind that the PSROs are doctor-constituted: They are adjuncts nevertheless of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Never before has government intruded so far into the practice of medicine.

As a matter of abstract justice, there ought to be some way to keep Medicaid and Medicare patients' doctors from prescribing unnecessary treatment. This much is easy to admit. But PSROs are likely to do far more harm than good.

They are the entering wedge for government medicine—for Washington's take-over of the whole profession. If government can prescribe treatment standards for Medicare and Medicaid patients, why not for all patients?

Good question. For government may soon be doing just that. President Nixon's health insurance proposal would put all health care under PSRO supervision. So much, in that case, for your doctor's freedom to exercise his own judgment. He would treat his patients the way the PSRO told him to treat them. No better, no worse.

But Texas doctors, through the Texas Medical Association, are going to take legal and legislative action against the PSRO concept. And so are the doctors of other states. They want PSROs wiped off the statute books. They should fight as hard as they can; for this is one battle they cannot afford to lose.

#### FARMERS STAND TO LOSE MUCH UNDER LAND-USE BILL

### HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, late this week the House will consider H.R. 10294, the Federal land-use bill, reported from the Committee on the Interior. As one of those who opposed this legislation in committee, one of my particular concerns was the impact that this will have on our farm families and those who own farms across the Nation.

I am pleased to see that the American Farm Bureau has announced their opposition to H.R. 10294, and I include at this point in my remarks an article from the June 10 issue of Farm Bureau News which details their position.

#### FB FIGHTS FOR SUBSTITUTE BILL ON LAND-USE PLANNING

Land use planning legislation, once considered dead for this Congressional session, is expected to reach the floor of the House of Representatives on June 11.

The House Rules Committee on May 14 voted 8 to 7 to send H.R. 10294, known as the Udall bill, to the House floor. This was a reversal of a February 26 vote which was to delay action on the bill indefinitely.

Farm Bureau leaders at the national, state, and county levels are coordinating a major effort to change the bill or defeat it.

In a June 3 letter to all members of the House, the American Farm Bureau Federation urged them to support a substitute bill (H.R. 13790) to be offered by Representative Sam Steiger (R., Ariz.). This bill eliminates the controversial federal control features by simply providing for federal grants to the states to help them establish land use planning programs.

In the event the Steiger substitute bill fails, FB called for a vote against passage of the Udall bill. This bill provides for detailed federal guidelines on state land use plans and no grants to states until such guidelines are met.

FB seeks to keep land use planning at local levels where it says consideration can be given to the needs of the people in the area. It consistently has opposed federal assistance to states for land use planning except under a grant-in-aid program. Another major FB point is that "funds available to a state should not be withheld as a weapon to enforce compliance with such a program."

Members of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee who voted against reporting the Udall bill said in their minority report that it was "merely the first step on the road toward more public control over the use of private property."

#### TRICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION FOR CITY OF WATERBURY, CONN.

### HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Waterbury, Conn., has just completed the celebration of its 300th birthday with a parade that may very well have been the largest and longest parade ever held on the east coast of the United States. The parade took over 5 hours to pass and review with 25,000 marchers, 210 units, 81 floats, and 40 bands and was witnessed by more than 200,000 people.

Activities were held in many locations throughout the city with the green in the center of town serving as the focal point for historical and cultural displays.

The Waterbury Historical Spectacular Pageant held at the municipal stadium was a huge success and had a cast of over 1,000 Waterbury citizens.

When so many people work so hard on a project of this nature, it is always impossible to list and thank each and every one. To all of these unnamed, hard-working individuals, I want to offer my personal congratulations and thanks for a job well done.

I was pleased to be able to participate in many of the events that were held during the weeklong celebration of the Brass City's tercentennial anniversary and was impressed by the community spirit and enthusiasm displayed by the citizens of this great city.

I am enclosing at this point in my remarks, statements of both myself and the Honorable Victor A. Mambruno, mayor of Waterbury, Conn., as they appeared in the commemorative book,

*The Honorable Victor A. Mambruno, Mayor, and the Citizens of Waterbury.*

It is with great pride that my family and I extend our warmest best wishes on the occasion of the celebration of the Three Hundredth Anniversary of the City of Waterbury. This marks an important milestone in the continuing journey from proud history to promising future.

From its earliest days as an outpost on the frontier of the New World, with all the challenges that entailed, to its earning of the proud title of "Brass City" as an industrial hub of the world, from the agony of the disastrous flood of 1955 to the present era of rebirth, rebuilding and renewal, the people of Waterbury have persevered.

Waterbury has always played a significant role in my life. As a youth growing up in Beacon Falls, Waterbury was "The City," the urban center of our world. Later, on returning from four years service in the United States Navy, it was at the Waterbury Branch of the University of Connecticut that I was able to begin the educational program which eventually led to a degree in law and the challenge of public service. And it is Waterbury that is the largest of the twenty-six communities I am so honored to serve in the Congress of the United States.

While a tercentennial is by its very nature a celebration of the past, it should also be a rededication by all of us to the principles that have made this city, this state, and this nation great. Knowing the people of Waterbury, I am confident they view this occasion in that light and that the future will hold

even greater achievements. I am grateful for the role I have been allowed to play in this celebration and in the public life of Waterbury.

Looking forward confidently to the future, I remain,

Yours truly,

RONALD A. SARASIN.

TO THE CITIZENS OF WATERBURY, CONN.

Greetings on the observance of the 300th anniversary of the founding of our City.

No anniversary celebrating the birth of a City is meaningful unless its citizens can reflect with pride on the happenings of the years gone by. And since we, the citizens of Waterbury, can boast of an honorable and prosperous past, we must be generous in our gratitude to those who preceded us and established and sustained a community which has been widely respected for its humanistic social principles and its industrial ingenuity. We are indeed indebted to the multitude of citizens who attained eminence in their profession through the years and chose to remain here to devote their knowledge and skills toward the advancement of our municipality.

Waterbury has been long famous for the variety of its manufactured products. There is a saying that no home exists in the United States in which there cannot be found at least one item manufactured in Waterbury. The saying is not an exaggerated claim to prominence. It is an accurate appraisal of our City's industrial progress since its founding—progress for which we have just cause for rejoicing during this anniversary year.

Because of the expert and diligent planning by the various committees of "Waterbury 300", I am certain that all of us, participants and spectators, Waterburyans and visitors, will enjoy to the fullest the many activities scheduled for presentation during our Tercentennial celebration.

I would like to express my deep appreciation to all of those citizens who have contributed so much of their time and effort toward making our anniversary observance a success. I offer special thanks to those who worked on the preparation of this commemorative book, and to the individuals and firms whose financial assistance as sponsors made possible its publication.

#### BEST OF LUCK—HERB HOFFMAN

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress 8 years ago, among the careerists in the executive branch with whom I first came in contact was Herb Hoffman, the legislative liaison for the Department of Justice. The manner in which he approached his job, the competence and diligence with which he discharged his responsibilities, and the ever-present cheery disposition he displayed impressed me then and continue to impress me now.

At the request of Manny Celler, then chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Herb joined the committee staff 3 years ago. Since then the committee has had the benefit of his keen legal counsel, and has been the beneficiary of his loyalties, efforts, and accomplishments.

Now, after 30 years of distinguished

service in Government service, Herb is retiring to try his wings in a new and challenging job as director of the Government Relations Office of the American Bar Association. We, in Congress, are indeed fortunate to have this able, energetic "young" man appointed as the highest staff officer of the prestigious American Bar Association. In his new capacity he will be our Washington link with the 180,000 member association of lawyers from coast to coast, acting as a two-way street to assist in the solving of the perplexing problems of our time.

I congratulate the ABA on its astute appointment; I wish Herb much success in his new venture.

### BAN THE GROWING OF OPIUM POPPIES

#### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, June 6, 1974, Congressmen RANGEL, DERWINSKI, and MURPHY of Illinois joined with me in a press conference to announce that our resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 507, concerning the possibility to Turkey lifting its present ban on the growing of opium poppies, had achieved cosponsorship of 227 Representatives, more than half of the Members of the House. At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert my remarks at the press conference, as well as a complete list of cosponsors of the resolution:

#### STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE LESTER L. WOLFF

I have called this press conference today to announce that 237 Members of the House, a clear majority, have joined as cosponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 507. This resolution urges the President to negotiate with the Turkish government to prevent a dissolution of the Turkey poppy growing ban. It also directs the President to exercise his authority to cut off all U.S. aid to Turkey should these negotiations fail and Turkey resume poppy production.

House cosponsorship of this resolution is broad and bi-partisan. It includes Speaker Carl Albert, Minority Leader John Rhodes and Majority Leader Tip O'Neill. The overwhelming support it has received indicates that the U.S. House of Representatives is sending an unequivocal message to the Turkish government that our commitment to rid this Nation of the drug menace will not be eroded for any reason.

This resolution should not be considered as a threat against the Turkish government, but rather as a tool to deal with the realities of a situation which carries the gravest implications for this Nation's wellbeing. Should Turkey's present efforts to resume poppy cultivation succeed, we may expect to lose an additional 250,000 young Americans to the ravishes of drug addiction.

Prior to the institution of the Turkish opium ban two years ago, there were approximately 500,000 heroin addicts in the United States. The effect of the opium ban has been to cut that number virtually in half. I quote from Jerome Hornbliss, Commissioner of the New York City Addiction Agency: "Since 1972, when the Turkish government in re-

sponsibility to come to our assistance, just as we have in the past come to their defense. At the first meeting of the Cabinet Committee on International Narcotics Control, President Nixon stated that "winning the battle against drug abuse is one of the most important, the most urgent national priorities confronting the United States today. I consider keeping dangerous drugs out of the United States just as important as keeping armed enemy forces from landing in the United States." It is not an exaggeration to use the metaphors of war in talking about the drug menace. A full-scale, comprehensive battle, involving full international cooperation is urgently needed if we are every to destroy this enemy, and this is the message which the House is sending to the Turkish government.

President Nixon also said: "Any government whose leaders participate in or protect the activities of those who contribute to our drug problem should know that the President of the United States is required by statute to suspend all American economic and military assistance to such a regime and I shall not hesitate to comply with that law where there are any violations." The Administration has requested \$215 million in military assistance for Turkey and almost \$20 million in economic aid. While the House is considering this request, we are also asking the President to consider his past statements on drug abuse and the impact which the resumption of Turkish opium production will have on our drug problem.

President Nixon also said: "Any government whose leaders participate in or protect the activities of those who contribute to our drug problem should know that the President of the United States is required by statute to suspend all American economic and military assistance to such a regime and I shall not hesitate to comply with that law where there are any violations." The Administration has requested \$215 million in military assistance for Turkey and almost \$20 million in economic aid. While the House is considering this request, we are also asking the President to consider his past statements on drug abuse and the impact which the resumption of Turkish opium production will have on our drug problem.

Let us look even further at the realities of the situation to which H. Con. Res. 507 addresses itself. Prior to the opium ban, the majority, up to 80%, of the heroin destined for our eastern shores came from Turkish poppies via the now nearly defunct French Connection. Over half a million Americans were enslaved by the drug menace. \$27 billion worth of property in the U.S. was stolen each year in connection with heroin addiction. From our point of view, the drug problem prior to the opium ban had reached near epidemic proportions.

Now let us weigh these statistics and the extent of our drug problem with the stakes involved as far as Turkey is concerned should the ban be lifted. The illicit production of opium in Turkey from 1969 until the ban was imposed brought the Turks only \$5 million a year. Less than 1% of the population of Turkey was engaged in opium production at the time the ban was instituted, and less than 1% of Turkey's gross national product is derived from poppy cultivation. In other words, 99% of the Turkish population is not jeopardized by the opium ban, and in reality, those who will profit most from resumption of opium production will be the illicit drug traffickers.

When we balance the scales of implication and consider the stakes involved for both Turkey and the United States if the opium ban is lifted, we have no choice but to take every step possible to prevent resumption of poppy cultivation. The House does not wish to impose its will upon the Turkish people, but it should seem obvious that it is not the majority of the Turkish people who are involved in opium production. It would seem, rather, that there are those in the political scene who would exploit the Turkish people by insisting that the ban is harmful to their people's well-being.

The Turkish government claims that there was no definite agreement with our government to end poppy cultivation. And yet, Turkey has been quite willing to accept the fruits of that agreement, namely the \$36 million in U.S. subsidies to prevent opium production. The Turkish government also claims that any agreement that was made was done so with a military government not duly elected by the people, and is thus invalid. Are we then to assume that all previous agreements that have been made between the U.S. and Turkey are now inoperative? I seriously doubt that the Turks would want to nullify the mutual defense treaty we have with them, or give back the more than \$3 billion in military assistance we have provided.

The point is, the present Turkish government continues to ignore the basic reality of the situation involved here—that our country is literally involved in an all-out war on heroin addiction, and that Turkey has a

responsibility to come to our assistance, just as we have in the past come to their defense. At the first meeting of the Cabinet Committee on International Narcotics Control, President Nixon stated that "winning the battle against drug abuse is one of the most important, the most urgent national priorities confronting the United States today. I consider keeping dangerous drugs out of the United States just as important as keeping armed enemy forces from landing in the United States." It is not an exaggeration to use the metaphors of war in talking about the drug menace. A full-scale, comprehensive battle, involving full international cooperation is urgently needed if we are every to destroy this enemy, and this is the message which the House is sending to the Turkish government.

President Nixon also said: "Any government whose leaders participate in or protect the activities of those who contribute to our drug problem should know that the President of the United States is required by statute to suspend all American economic and military assistance to such a regime and I shall not hesitate to comply with that law where there are any violations." The Administration has requested \$215 million in military assistance for Turkey and almost \$20 million in economic aid. While the House is considering this request, we are also asking the President to consider his past statements on drug abuse and the impact which the resumption of Turkish opium production will have on our drug problem.

#### COSPONSORS OF H. CON. RES. 507

Wolff, Rangel, Rodino, Abzug, Addabbo, Albert, Alexander, Annunzio, Aspin, Badillo, Barrett, Beard, Bell, Benitez, Bergland, Bevil, Biaggi, Bingham, Blatnik, Boland, Bowen, Brademas, Brasco, Breaux, Brozman, Broyhill, George Brown, Clarence Brown, Buchanan, Burke (Calif.), Burke (Mass.), Burke (Fla.), Carey, Carney, Cacer, Chamberlain, Chisholm, Clark, Clawson, Clay, Collins (Ill.), Conte, Conyers, Corman, Cotter, Crane, Dominick Daniels, Danielson, John Davis, Mendel Davis, Delaney, Delums, de Lugo, Denholm, Dent, Derwinski, Diggs.

Dingell, Donohue, Downing, Drinan, Dulski, Duncan, du Pont, Edwards (Calif.), Ellberg, Esch, Frank Evans, Joe Evins, Fascell, Fish, Flood, Flowers, Ford, Frenzel, Fulton, Fuqua, Gaydos, Gettys, Gilman, Goldwater, Gonzalez, Grasso, Gray, William Green, Griffiths, Grover, Gubser, Gunter, Haley, Hammerschmidt, Hanna, Hanley, Harrington, Hawkins, Mrs. Heckler (Mass.), Hechler (W. Va.), Heinz, Henderson, Hicks, Hogan, Holtzman, Huber, Hungate, Hunt, Ichord, Johnson (Pa.), Bob Jones, Jones (Okla.), Jordan, Karth, Kastenmeier.

Kazen, Kemp, King, Kluczynski, Koch, Kyros, Lagomarsino, Landgrebe, Latta, Leggett, Lehman, Lent, Long (Md.), Long (La.), Lujan, Luken, McCormack, McDade, McFall, McKay, Madden, Maraziti, Martin (N.C.), Mathias, Matsunaga, Mazzoli, Metcalfe, Mezhvinsky, Miller, Mills, Mink, Minshall, Mitchell (N.Y.), Mitchell (Md.), Mizell, Moakley, Montgomery, Moorhead (Pa.), Moss, Murphy (N.Y.), Murphy (Ill.), Murtha, Myers, Nix, O'Brien, O'Hara, O'Neill, Owens, Patten, Pepper, Perkins, Peyser, Podell, Bob Price (Tex.), Price (Ill.).

Quie, Rallsback, Rarick, Regula, Rhodes, Riegle, Roberts, Roe, Roncalio (Pa.), Roncalio (N.Y.), Rosenthal, Rostenkowski, Roush, Rousselot, Roy, Roybal, Ryan, St Germain, Sarasin, Sarbanes, Scherle, Schroeder, Seiberling, Shuster, Sikes, Sisk, Skubitz, Henry P. Smith, Neal Smith, Snyder, Spence, James V. Stanton, Stark, Steed, Steele, Stephens, Stokes, Studds, Roy A. Taylor, Thornton, Tiernan, Traxler, Udall, Vander Veen, Vanik, Vigorito, Waggonner, Waldie, Walsh, Whalen, White, Chas. Wilson (Calif.),

Chas. Wilson (Tex.), Bob Wilson (Calif.), Yates, Yatron, Young (Ga.), Young (S.C.), Zion.

# ETHNIC STUDIES: A NEW PRIDE IN THE OLD COUNTRY

## HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman from Cleveland, one of the ethnic capitals of America, and home of over 500,000 men and women of foreign stock, I am vitally concerned about the future of the ethnic studies program, title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The program symbolizes a new thought in America's life, that one's ethnic background is something he should take pride in; that it is a valuable heritage, to be passed on from generation to generation. Not long ago, it was considered to be unfashionable to speak in terms of one's nationality. There was a belief that to become a "true American," one had to forsake the history, customs, and traditions of his ancestors.

Fortunately, this snobbish notion that we must somehow be ashamed of our ethnic background has now been rejected. We have come to realize that America became a great nation not by rejecting all that the Old World had to offer, but by accepting and nourishing the best of each nationality and culture. We realize that America will continue to be great only so long as it lives up to the promise of tolerance and respect for diversity that makes it unique.

This is an important time for the ethnic heritage movement, Mr. Speaker, for under the ethnic heritage studies program, the first major Federal effort in this area, grants of over \$2 million will be made for study projects across the country.

Ethnic leaders of the Cleveland area are seizing the opportunity offered by the act. Their application combines the resources of the Cleveland Board of Education, the area colleges, and the ethnic organizations. It provides for a gathering of the study materials now existing in the community, as well as for further research. The study project will formulate elementary and secondary school courses in ethnic studies based on these materials, and the courses will be taught by instructors trained in the use of the material.

The comprehensive approach taken by the Cleveland area is excellent, making the fullest possible use of the vast resources in the community. This program could even include having older people with special skills or knowledge come into the classroom to teach the children the music, the history, the cooking, the language of the old country.

I regret that, despite the promise of projects such as this, the outlook for the ethnic heritage studies program is not good. The major reason for this dim outlook, Mr. Speaker, is the attitude of the

Nixon administration. The record of the administration on the ethnic studies program shows these officials to have distinguished themselves as "election-year ethnics."

In 1972, the year the ethnic studies program was enacted into law, Mr. Nixon courted ethnic voters assiduously. But in January 1973, when he submitted his budget, the President requested absolutely nothing in funding for ethnic studies. Now, in 1974, the President included \$2 million in his budget for program funding, but he did this only after Congress prodded him by passing a funding bill. While this amount will get the program off the ground, it is a mere pittance compared to the \$15 million which Congress has authorized for the program. Furthermore, the President's budget specifically states that he wants no funding in 1975.

Both the House and Senate have this year passed comprehensive education bills, and the legislation is now in conference. The Senate approved, as part of this bill, H.R. 69, a provision extending the ethnic heritage studies program for 5 years, with an authorization of \$15 million per year. The House bill includes no provision on ethnic heritage. I strongly urge my colleagues on the Conference Committee to accept the Senate position.

## BUILDING SOVIET AIR POWER

## HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Boeing Aircraft Co. and the Soviet Union have signed a protocol in Moscow to formalize discussions on joint aviation projects. These projects may include the construction of an aircraft plant in the Soviet Union and development of new passenger aircraft and helicopters. While these projects are only in the discussion stage, there is an exchange of scientific and technical information in "the civil aviation field." In other words, the Soviets are gaining information on American aircraft technology at this time.

While reports of the protocol are careful to make mention of civil aviation, it is important to remember that the various technologies used for civilian aircraft can often be easily adapted for military use. Some examples of Boeing civilian aircraft that have been adapted for military purposes and presently used by the U.S. Air Force are the E-3A based on the 747B, the KC-135 Stratotanker and the C-135 Stratolifter based on the 707, and the T-43A based on the 737-200.

In addition to the aircraft that I have just mentioned, Boeing has a number of other aircraft and missiles in use by the U.S. Air Force. These include the B-52, KC-97L, C-97G, LGM-30 F/G Minuteman ICBM, AGM-69A supersonic air-to-surface nuclear missiles, and the Burner II and Burner IIA booster missiles.

The Boeing Aircraft Co. also is involved in contractual work for the Air

Force in the development of advanced medium short take-off and landing transport. The Air Force awarded Boeing a contract for remotely piloted vehicles. Boeing has been developing the YQM-94A, a long-range high-altitude model to be used primarily for signal intelligence collection.

Boeing has an important role in American civil aviation—the 707, 727, 737, 747—and, as I have shown, it also has an important role in American military aviation. It is easy to understand why the Soviets are interested in gaining American technology in this field. As an aside, it is interesting to note that Aeroflot, the Soviet airline completely dependent on Soviet aircraft, has been described as "the world's most dangerous and inefficient airline." What is difficult to understand is why the U.S. Government should allow firms to help the Soviets out of their aircraft problems, particularly when much "civil" aircraft technology is readily adaptable for military purposes.

Soviet aircraft technology is not in the interests of the United States. It must be stopped.

At this point I include in the RECORD the article "Boeing Signs Air Protocol With Soviets" from the Washington Post of June 6, 1974:

### BOEING SIGNS AIR PROTOCOL WITH SOVIETS

The Boeing Aircraft Co. and the Soviet Union signed, a protocol in Moscow yesterday on formalizing discussions on joint civil aviation projects—perhaps including the construction of an American-designed aircraft plant in Russia.

Besides the plant, the Soviet news agency Tass said the cooperative agreement could result eventually in the joint design and development of new passenger aircraft and helicopters.

But Boeing discouraged speculation that any big project was imminent. The company said discussions with Soviet officials have been going on since 1971 and the protocol "allows these discussions to proceed in a more formal manner."

Boeing said further that the discussions with the Russians to date "are limited to the exchange of scientific and technical information in the civil aviation field."

Before any aircraft agreements could be made, Boeing would have to receive the approval of the State and Defense departments. One obvious concern of the American military would be whether the Soviet Union would gain valuable technology for its bombers and fighters.

One company official stressed that these and other questions would take considerable time to resolve—meaning the protocol is just one of the early steps towards a significant cooperative agreement.

## STILL OPPOSED TO SCHOOLBUSING

## HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was recorded as voting in the negative on the motion by Congressman MARVIN L. ESCH which appears on page 17882 of the June 5 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This is in diametric opposition to my views and I wish to take this opportu-

nity to make my views on this matter clear. I have been and remain opposed to forced schoolbusing.

#### WHY IS IT OUR RESPONSIBILITY?

### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask a question which has not been satisfactorily answered despite its pertinence over the last quarter century. When and by what means were the American people made financially responsible for the supposed well-being of the rest of the world?

The question arises once more in the contention of John M. Hennessy, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, that U.S. tax dollars in the amount of another billion should be contributed during the coming year to International Development Banks for Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

Mr. Hennessy, of course, speaks for the administration. And his arguments in favor of this billion-dollar contribution reflect, I take it, the White House attitude which obviously has not been changed one bit by the present plight of our dollar abroad, the inflation at home, and the immense new cost burdens grinding down upon our people.

Mr. Hennessy contends that the increase in the crude oil price, plus the increases in the costs of food and fertilizers, has placed a heavy burden on the "least developed" countries and thus demands that we Americans continue our generosity from now until at least 1980.

And why us? Mr. Hennessy has a ready answer. Unless we keep lading out our tax dollars to loan funds for development projects, we may aggravate the problems of these other countries and also undermine our efforts to get the new oil-rich nations to contribute more than they are doing now to alleviate world poverty.

Put another way, this debt-troubled, deficit-financed Nation, now facing internal economic problems of great magnitude, must, in Mr. Hennessy's and the administration's view, borrow more money at staggering interest rates in order to contribute this money to International Development Banks to be loaned at low interest rates—1 percent for example—to other countries.

And we are to undertake this—worsening of our own fiscal situation—so that we might convince the oil black-malling Arab States to do more to help, in large part, their neighbors in Africa and in Asia. Has there ever been a more absurd reading of a Nation's international responsibility.

We have given away more billions to date than even the Washington computers can calculate, the methods of giving being so varied and complex. We have more debt already upon us than the debt of all the rest of the world combined. We are functioning on a deficit greater than the spending budgets of most other

nations. And still, according to Mr. Hennessy we somehow are responsible too for easing the effects of the Arab price boost and the higher costs of food and fertilizers on others when we have not eased them here at home.

As for me, I am against adding 1 U.S. tax dollar to the giveaways, whether they be in the form of loans or outright grants. And I cannot, and shall not, accept the specious premise of this administration that we must use our scarce tax dollars to convince the rich Arab oil states that they should do more for the less fortunate countries. Let world opinion apply the pressure on the Arabs. At least, let us give it a try. It cannot assert itself as long as Uncle Sam keeps playing the sucker as willingly as Mr. Hennessy insists he should.

#### MARINES LAND TO SUPPORT HISC

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Marines have landed on the legislative beaches and are prepared to join the engagement precipitated by the House Select Committee on Committees' proposal to abolish the House Committee on Internal Security and "transfer its functions" to the Committee on Government Operations.

The Marine Corps League unequivocally opposes any effort to transfer, to curtail, or to delete HISC's present authority, according to the magnanimous message sent to selected Members of the House by Mr. C. A. McKinney, the league's legislative officer, on behalf of the National Commandant.

Noting that the committee "has earned its battle streamers" and "stands tall" as a bastion of democracy, the league's letter of June 5, cites HISC's role as a check or warning device against those who would attack this Nation from within as the corps itself acts as a deterrent to outside aggression. The league's letter, which follows and which is deeply appreciated I am sure, by all members who have, over the years, supported the committee, offers HISC its "vote and confidence."

The letter follows:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,  
MARINE CORPS LEAGUE,  
June 5, 1974.

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,  
Ranking Minority Member, House Committee on Internal Security, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASHBROOK: It is our understanding that the House Committee on Select Committees' recommendation for restructuring has been referred for further study to a special subcommittee of the Democratic Caucus chaired by the Honorable Julia B. Hansen, Congresswoman from Washington.

The Marine Corps League has reviewed the restructuring proposal with concern. It noted that the Committee recommends the transfer of the House Committee on Internal Security to the Committee on Government Operations.

As we interpret the provision, the transfer will not include the composite movement of the HISC staff or files, nor provides for the continuity of the Committee's necessary work in investigating organizations that threaten the very existence of this Nation.

This being the case, the League, a congressionally-chartered association, composed entirely of Marines and veteran Marines, unequivocally opposes any efforts by the House Members to transfer the Internal Security Committee, or curtail or delete any of its present authority as a separate committee of the House of Representatives.

The history of the HISC has been one of dedication and duty to Country and the American public. It has brought to the attention of one and all the elements within the United States that advocate the downfall of our Nation, or who threaten its principles as bequeathed to us by our Founding Fathers.

These elements have and are continuing to infiltrate every conceivable activity that may, can, or will influence the American citizenry. Subversive groups have placed their members in the Nation's schools, public offices, governmental positions, and even in our Armed Forces. Consequently, they have been somewhat successful in contributing to the recession of many of our American ideals and practices.

Only the House Committee on Internal Security "stands tall" as a bastion of democracy. It has served the Congress and the American public as a "warning device" against those who would tear down this great Republic.

Although the Committee has not been in existence as long as the United States Marine Corps, it certainly has earned its battle streamers as a defender of the Nation within. Where the Corps stands as a deterrent to outside aggression, the HISC continues to maintain a check against those who would attack us from the inside.

The House Committee on Internal Security has the vote and confidence of the Marine Corps League and, as our Marines, has through dedication, loyalty, and service to Country further earned the right to use the Marine Corps League's motto, "Semper Fidelis"—("always faithful").

To "sink" the Committee at this time when our Nation stands in peril is the worst that could happen to the internal defenses of our Nation's security.

Semper Fidelis,  
C. A. MCKINNEY,  
National Legislative Officer for the  
National Commandant.

#### AMENDMENT TO H.R. 10294

### HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow when the House considers H.R. 10294 I plan to offer an amendment which I believe will help fulfill the purpose of public participation in the land use process.

In order to give timely notice the text of the amendment follows:

Amendment to H.R. 10294, as reported, offered by Mr. GUNTER:

Page 29, line 16, immediately before "substantial" insert the following: "public hearings in sufficient numbers and places within the State so as to assure easy accessibility by all local governmental officials, and the public generally, to such public hearings, as well as other methods of".

## "GEMUETLICHKEIT"

## HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, this week, June 9-15, the citizens of Frankenmuth, Mich., are celebrating their 18th annual Bavarian Festival. The week-long celebration is a time when over 200,000 festival-goers are expected to join in the spirit of Bavarian fellowship, a time when the charm and excitement of the "Old World" come to life again.

Located in the green rural heartland of Michigan, Frankenmuth is an oasis of beauty and charm, healthful, and relaxing living. The 1.3 million people who visit Frankenmuth every year find a cordial unassuming atmosphere, a suggestion of the bountiful farm dinners and cheerful way of life many of them enjoyed in their youth.

Frankenmuth is a place where one can still find the "gemuetlichkeit" of old Bavaria. Never translated the same way by any two Germans, "gemuetlichkeit" is a comfortable way of life, a life that tastes the flavor of good food, good homes, good business and good fellowship.

The 129-year-old city of Frankenmuth was conceived in 1845 as an unique experiment. A Bavarian Lutheran missionary society interested in bringing the Gospel to the Chippewa Indians decided that a pastor with a small group of believers would illustrate Christianity better than a single missionary. So on April 20, 1845, a company of 15 German Lutheran emigrants embarked from Bremerhaven, arriving in Frankenmuth 3 months later.

It was a large and unpopulated country that received the group of settlers. Their only connections with the outside world were the navigable Cass River and the Indian trails which wound their way through the dense forests. Yet those 15 people, far from Germany with its fortified cities and its sense of history that stretched back to the Middle Ages, eagerly embraced the new land—cleared the soil, grew crops and made it their home. Through sound agricultural practices, the Frankenmuth settlers carved out and have kept for almost 130 years fertile and productive fields and fruitful gardens.

True to their calling, the first building the settlers erected in the New World was their church. The present St. Lorenz Lutheran Church, built across the street from where the original log church once stood, is one of Michigan's oldest and largest Lutheran congregations. Since its founding in 1845, the church has remained a center for the spreading of the Lutheran faith, sending out more than 200 men and women into the Lutheran ministry and teaching profession. The St. Lorenz School is the largest Protestant parochial school in the Nation, with over 700 students enrolled.

In its pioneer days Frankenmuth was not only a missionary colony, it was a

lumbering town as well, filled with men of courage and gusto, skilled at their hazardous work. A sawmill became the nucleus of the early Frankenmuth.

Because the railroads never penetrated the boundaries of the town, the Bavarian traditions and culture of the community have remained. One of the major Bavarian attractions of the city is the Frankenmuth style chicken dinners served at two large restaurants—Zehnder's and, directly across the street, the Bavarian Inn, both operated by the Zehnder family. Together these restaurants often serve 20,000 meals a week and as many as 8,000 on a Sunday and employ over 500 people. Bronner's Christmas Showrooms and Tannenbaum Shop feature the country's largest display of indoor and outdoor decorations; many of the decorations are the firm's own designs and are made to order by European and Oriental glass artisans. For over 100 years, Frankenmuth has produced its own brand of beer. Carling established a plant in the city around the turn of the century and is now recognized as operating Michigan's most modern brewery. The town also boasts the Frankenmuth Cheese Haus—the town gave its name to Frankenmuth cheese, a whipped curd-type developed here—Rupprecht's Sausage Haus, a woodworking shop, metalworking and machine building shops, the Frankenmuth Mutual Insurance Co., and the Frankenmuth State Bank. The Frankenmuth News has been a voice rallying Frankenmuth citizens to innumerable achievements since 1906.

Frankenmuth is constantly reaching into the past and yet it does not forget the future. Modern life gracefully fuses with the tradition of history, inexhaustible vitality with age. Today, a growing town of 4,000 people, a city with the capacity to adapt to change, as its many modern schools, parks, homes, insurance company and banks testify, Frankenmuth's significant achievements and progress are a result of quiet evolution, a blending of past with present.

Pre-Bavarian festival activities began Saturday with the "Festival of Bugles and Drums" competition featuring corps from surrounding States and Canada. On Sunday the festival officially opened with a parade of marching bands and colorful floats. The "Spas Platz" is open every day from noon to midnight featuring top name polka bands, arts, and crafts exhibits from all over the United States, children's activities and the "jungviehhof"—small animal farm. Bavarian "mädchens" in traditional German attire will be on hand to dish up plenty of the Frankenmuth food—delicious barbecued chicken plate dinners, bratwurst and other Bavarian specialties—topped with foamy steins of Frankenmuth's own favorite beverage—beer.

Many Michigan towns have an underlying European culture; a few like Holland—Dutch—and Posen—Polish—commemorate it with festivals. But Frankenmuth and its Bavarian Festival are uniquely entertaining and exciting. I would like to extend an invitation to my colleagues and all Americans who may be traveling or vacationing in Michigan

this week to spend a day enjoying the Old World flavor of this nationally known festival. To them, on behalf of the people of Frankenmuth, I extend the traditional greeting of Germans everywhere—"Willkommen."

## THE DEFENSE CONFIDENCE GAME

## HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee and a participant of the debates on military spending in this body, I sometimes feel an air of unreality about our doctrines and the official "missions" for the various proposed weapons systems, but somehow, I do not think we are arguing about what is really important, as far as military decisionmaking is concerned. I fact, if we look at the story of military spending since World War II as a whole, we see very clearly that doctrine follows the weapon system, and not vice versa. Indeed, I do not think I am overly suspicious when I think that our arguments about strategic doctrines are a distraction from the real issues.

For one thing, the strategic doctrines all seem to go in one direction—toward greater technological complexity—as one replaces another. As Mary Kaldor and Alexander Cockburn, the authors of an excellent recent article in the New York Review of Books put it:

Arguments of this kind can never be resolved. They escape the objective test of war, and in peacetime one strategic policy can succeed another with no ultimately convincing criterion of its superiority. The tendency, of course, is for the strategies to spiral upward in expense and baroque elaboration, rather than downward to a cheap simple system to destroy the world . . . Such debates and forward perspectives err to the extent that they are conducted in a political vacuum.

Could it be that the reason for this mounting complexity has something to do with the capacities and needs of the research and development bureaucracy, both in the Pentagon and in so-called "private industry?"

The first wave of weapons production after the Second World War began to subside in the late Fifties. In the resulting trough a plethora of new projects was introduced . . . A decade later large cuts in the space budget coincided with recession in civil aviation and merchant shipping. The second great wave of postwar military boondoggles was subsiding: the time was propitious for a new set of decisions.

I invite my colleagues to read this well-researched and well-presented article, and to introduce some reality into our debates. I believe the article convincingly shows that the Pentagon claim that the budget is not going up is a result of juggling with figures and some very generous assumptions. Another excuse for the present building program—the "aggressive Soviet modernization pro-

gram"—is also put into context, the context of overwhelming Soviet inferiority. We should not let the Pentagon set the terms for our debates, and look beyond their spurious issues to the real dynamics of military spending.

The first half of the article follows:

#### THE DEFENSE CONFIDENCE GAME

(By Mary Kaldor and Alexander Cockburn)

Report of the Secretary of Defense, James R. Schlesinger, to the Congress on the FY 1975 Defense Budget and FY 1975-1979 Defense Program, U.S. Government Printing Office, \$2.60.

I

Although it would be frivolous to devote extensive space to the purely stylistic aspects of James Schlesinger's 1975 defense budget we should note at the outset that his prose is that of a man visibly animated by strong and eccentric emotions. One would not expect someone who spends his hours of relaxation listening to tape recordings of bird song, and his hours of worship at the Lutheran church making careful notes on the sermon, to produce merely humdrum requests for money.<sup>1</sup>

On the very first page of the budget he is quoting the psalmist to the effect that "where there is no vision the people perish," and after sixteen pages he has taken wings: "Eli Whitney belongs to us, not to our competitors. He rather than the medieval craftsmen of Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartre—however magnificent and unique their art—must once again become our model. The startling invocation of Eli Whitney follows immediately after sentiments less exalted, but more to the point: "We can and must become increasingly competitive with potential adversaries in a more fundamental sense. We must not be forced out of the market—on land, at sea or in the air."

This is by way of introduction to Schlesinger's main theme: "This is our first peacetime defense budget in a decade. It is therefore an appropriate time to consider best how to settle down for the long haul." In a reflex action, familiar to those who have immersed themselves in Pentagonese, this becomes "a long haul posture." But Schlesinger is not a stupid man and his budget is adroitly presented. It demands the closest scrutiny, for his vision of "the long haul posture" raises profound and gloomy questions about the nature of the arms race in the Seventies; about the real intentions of this peacetime budget and what it portends.

The most conspicuous feature of the FY (fiscal year) 1975 defense budget is its colossal size. "A policy," Schlesinger remarks, "requiring us to maintain our military strength and alliances while we are actively pursuing détente with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China may appear to some as incongruous." The incongruity, expressed in round figures, amounts to this: the DOD has requested budgetary authority to spend \$99.1 billion (the largest ever, with the exception of 1942 when the figure was \$99.5 billion) and the DOD's estimated outlay is \$85.8 billion, the largest sum ever to be spent by the Defense Department. This, despite DOD claims to the contrary, represents an 8 percent real increase on the outlays for FY 1942.<sup>2</sup>

To adjust ourselves to the atmospheric conditions required to maintain life and sanity on the DOD's budgetary planet we should begin by slowly breathing in the strange terminology of defense jargon. Unfamiliar flora and fauna abound: Worst Case Analysis (consideration of the worst things that could possibly happen, and consequent response to them as though they were true) and adjacent to this concept its half brother, Higher Than Expected Threat. Penalties (pen-

etration aids) move through the somber heavens.

Strange sets of initials, too cumbersome even to be acronyms, come sliding out of the swamp, unrecognizable to all but the most expert of zoologists. Here comes AABNCP (E-4).

The AABNCP program, as currently planned, would be pursued in several stages geared to our growing understanding of the command and control problem in a nuclear war environment, and to the further development of applicable technology. . . .

What is this? Actually it's the Advanced Airborne National Command Post: converted Boeing 747s stuffed with electronic equipment and high brass which can fly about for up to sixteen hours without refueling in the event of nuclear attack. The NEACP or National Emergency Airborne Command Post will carry the President himself, always assuming that he has survived the perilous transition between White House and Andrews Air Force Base.<sup>3</sup> A computer terminal aboard the E-4, connected directly to the "WWMCCS ground-based ADP system," will furnish the airborne commander in chief with progress reports on nuclear destruction for as long as the ground-based system continues to function. Thereafter, says Schlesinger bleakly, "it would have to operate in a manual mode." Unfortunately we do not yet know the cost and timing of the actual computer terminal, as opposed to the aircraft, since "it has yet to be fully defined."

This budget, with its "long haul posture," represents a significant increase in real expenditure—a Great Leap Forward of the kind that has occurred about every ten years. Each leap forward comes equipped with a new strategic doctrine: for example, in the early Fifties it was the doctrine of "massive retaliation," which justified the maintenance of high post-Korean War budgets. In the early Sixties it was the strategy of "flexible response." And now, in the dawn of the "long haul posture," we have Flexible Targeting Options which have come to be known as Counterforce. The announcement of a proposed new doctrine is not necessarily directly linked to huge budgetary appropriations (Schlesinger requests only \$310 million for Counterforce this year), but debate has developed conveniently about it, leaving such items as \$26.5 billion for operation and maintenance of existing forces under relatively less intense scrutiny. Counterforce, in short, has become this year's fashionable topic—an excellent lightning conductor.

Since 1967 the official strategic doctrine of the U.S. has been Assured Destruction, or—in its more companionable form—Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD). The essence of this strategy is simple enough. The enemy will be deterred from attempting a first strike by the prospect of instant destruction of its cities and industry. The Assured Destruction doctrine allows Schlesinger to say in this year's budget that even after a more brilliantly executed and devastating attack than we believe our potential adversaries could deliver, the United States would retain the capability to kill more than 30 percent of the Soviet population and destroy more than 75 percent of Soviet industry. At the same time we could hold in reserve a major capability against the PRC.

(It is reckoned by DOD strategists who exclude the capricious tyrant contingency from their calculations that the Soviet Union would regard as "unacceptable" the loss of 25 percent of its population and 50 percent of its industrial capacity. As Schlesinger remarks, these figures were arrived at in the Sixties because "beyond those levels very rapidly diminishing increments of damage would be achieved for each additional dollar invested.")

To achieve assured destruction the U.S. can count on approximately 6,000 deliverable warheads excluding those carried by strategic bombers and by tactical launchers based

overseas. The first set of SALT agreements were acknowledgments of the fact that both the USA and the USSR can inflict intolerable damage upon each other, and this mutual knowledge was assumed to be "stabilizing," a word much favored in such strategic debate.

What Schlesinger is now proposing as a topic for national debate is the doctrine of Flexible and Selective Targeting Options, popularly called Counterforce, although Schlesinger is careful to distinguish between the two. Counterforce means the ability to hit the other side's missile silos. It has been opposed by SALT strategists lest it should undermine the MAD doctrine and establish what is known in the business as a Disarming First Strike Incentive. Flexible Targeting Options means providing the President with the choice between Counterforce (missile silos) or Countervalue (people). Schlesinger makes great play with the essentially humanitarian features of his new doctrine in this regard, asking why "the terrible retribution" of MAD should be visited on the Russian people for "some ill-defined transgression of their leaders." He also argues that if one makes the idea of limited nuclear war credible (by lowering the nuclear threshold, so to speak), one enhances deterrence. An adversary is more likely to believe in nuclear retaliation for an act of aggression if retaliation does not entail general holocaust.

In effect FTO means acquiring a limited Counterforce "capability," or rather improving the efficiency of a Counterforce capability already possessed by present US missiles, which can now be retargeted to hit Soviet missile silos or indeed any other specific military objective. In any case a limited Counterforce capability does not fit the two arguments which might justify it. It cannot provide a disarming first strike so long as submarine-based missiles cannot be detected. On the other hand it is not sufficiently limited to avert massive retaliation. Schlesinger may feel the tenderest emotions toward the Russian people but he cannot really expect that nuclear explosions will not damage cities or industry, and that the Russians will not be prepared to reply in kind.

One of Schlesinger's rationales for this seemingly otiose "improvement" is based on the development of new heavy ICBMs by the Soviet Union and its testing for the first time last year of a MIRVed warhead (a missile which in flight releases several individually targetable warheads. The US tested its first MIRVs in 1968 and deployed them in 1970). Those developments in the Soviet strategic arsenal—still in the testing stage—could, according to Schlesinger, enable the Russians to destroy US missile silos.

The word used to frighten people about Russian ICBMs is their "throw-weight," that is to say, the size of the warhead they are capable of releasing. Russian missiles are not nearly as accurate as their American counterparts and thus need copious throwweight to produce sufficiently large explosions to compensate. This also means that Russian ICBMs will inevitably slaughter a large number of American citizens as well as accounting for missile silos. So why is Schlesinger suggesting that the USSR has a limited Counterforce capacity when his own theology of Counterforce implies "limited collateral damage"?

The "bargaining chip" rationale also makes its predictable appearance. Schlesinger says he needs to develop new strategic systems as bargaining counters in negotiations with the Russians and as a hedge against failure to reach agreement in strategic arms limitation. In the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings on the budget Senator Symington had some sour reflections, in this regard, on just how much the arms control disarmament discussion generally called SALT is costing our tax payers. The ABM was sold as a bargaining chip. Trident was sold as a bargaining chip and this new Counterforce targeting is being sold as a bargaining chip . . . I am worried about

Footnotes at end of article.

still more bargaining chips that pop up regularly and so heavily increase our costs.

Liberal arms controllers argue that although Counterforce demands small sums of money—\$310.7 million—it could provoke a new round in the arms race with enormously "destabilizing" consequences for the East-West relationship. They may be right. But Counterforce may justify an arms build-up quite apart from any Soviet arms increase and quite apart from the presumed merits of the new strategy. To see why we must first concentrate on the reasons why the US government spends over \$90 billion on defense, and what this expenditure actually means. Critics of the Pentagon, in this context, constantly refer to the "military-industrial complex" with rather rare inspection of what the complex actually implies.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> One assumes that the flourishes belong to Schlesinger. The budget was drafted by Professor William Kaufman of MIT. He was one of the defense intellectuals brought into the government by McNamara in 1960.

\* Anyone who takes too literally Schlesinger's lamentation that the US has a long tradition of arming with great haste when war comes upon us, and disarming with even greater haste when war is over<sup>1</sup> can take comfort from the fact that even using DOD figures we find that the "peace dividend"—the amount by which the defense budget falls after a war—is smaller than the amount spent annually fighting the war in Vietnam. In 1968 the total defense budget, excluding Vietnam running costs, was \$51.5 billion. The 1975 budget, in questionable DOD 1968 prices, is \$53.3 billion.

The claim that the 1975 budget is no larger in real terms than the 1974 one is not persuasive. This year the Pentagon presented not one budget, but two: fiscal year 1974 supplemental, in addition to fiscal year 1975. Generally such supplementals are for unexpected cost increases and emergencies of one sort or another. This year, in the supplemental budget, \$2.8 billion is required for "augmented force readiness." (Among such augmentations we find, for example, \$25 million needed to speed up the construction schedule for Trident submarines, slowed down by Congress last year. This is a task for which contractors have yet to be selected.) In addition the \$2.2 billion in emergency aid for Israel is shoved back into the 1974 base line defense costs. The net result is that a \$5 billion difference between FY 1975 and FY 1974 disappears.

There are further hazards, beyond efforts to retrieve this migrant \$5 billion. All the DOD figures of increase or decrease in real outlay are of course based on its methods of computation. Naturally the higher DOD's estimate of inflation, the lower the "real costs" become. Hence all pay increases are counted as inflation. But the shift to a volunteer army, with consequent higher pay rates, implies a real increase in performance. "Grade Creep"—the increase in the number of senior officers—and "top to tail"—the increase in the number of officers—are countered as inflation, and so are the increased salaries attendant on the shift from military to civilian employment.

But it does not require enormous wit to see that such pay increases represent increases in the real resources available to the Pentagon and therefore are not purely inflationary. Finally, for its price deflator the DOD uses an index of federal purchases which rises faster than the consumer price index. Federal purchases include weapons systems whose costs escalate rapidly. There is a tendency to count such costs as inflation rather than an increase in the real resources needed to produce an individual weapons system. In sum, any DOD boasts about the slim dimensions of the budget should be treated with the gravest suspicion.

<sup>2</sup> Should he miss the plane, all is not lost:

the WWMCCS (Worldwide Military Control and Command System) will keep him in touch, "no matter where he may be—in the White House, Camp David, San Clemente, Key Biscayne, or airborne."

#### II

The substantial increases in this year's budget are not due to a sudden change of heart toward the Soviet Union, or to a striking shift in strategic thinking. They are, rather, consequences of past decisions. The jumps in the Procurement and the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (R&D) budgets of 6 percent and 12 percent respectively are logical outcomes of hasty projects started within the last five years to compensate for the collapse of the Vietnam war boom. The rise in the R&D budget is particularly significant, for it represents additions to military know-how. All of it goes toward the enhancement rather than the maintenance of military capacity. Since the early Sixties the R&D budget has been constant or falling in real terms.

Its rise this year, just as in the early Sixties—and indeed in the early Fifties—represents a new phase in the arms race, a quantum leap in future arms spending consequent upon decisions taken to solve the industrial difficulties of 1968-1972. The R&D appropriation reverberates throughout the entire budget of which it seems merely one small part. An increase in R&D of 12 percent this year implies a much larger increase in total spending in the future. Schlesinger told the Senate Armed Services Committee that if there is a favorable SALT agreement and if the force structure is kept constant the budget will increase by five or six billion dollars a year. But the expansion implied by the increase in the R&D budget suggests that the growth will be at least twice that size.

These increases flow from the decision to preserve a capacity to make armaments; such a decision is also a decision to expand that capacity indefinitely. A capacity to produce, and above all to develop a modern weapons system involves scientists, specialized equipment, plant, machinery, and skilled workers who have to be continuously employed. But continuous employment also means continuous expansion. Employment of scientists produces technological advances. More importantly these advances are actually applied since corporations can only continue to sell their weapons if they possess attractive improvements over old weapons. They must offer something better than their competitors, something the military can justify to Congress.

But such improvements cost more money. Each new weapons system takes more people and materials to build than its predecessor. And although the number of weapons may be narrowed, this rarely compensates for the increase in cost to the Pentagon. This year's budget, for example, includes \$2.043 billion for the acquisition of Trident submarines as part of the \$13.5 billion program for ten submarines. The total acquisition cost of forty-one Polaris submarines, Trident's predecessor in the period 1959-1967, was only \$13.9 billion. The budget also includes provision for an alternative successor to Polaris, the Narwhal submarine.

What has come into being is the system known as the follow-on. The system started in the late Forties when new procurement decisions were taken to prevent the total collapse of specialized defense companies such as Boeing, Raytheon, and Bath Iron Works of Maine. Boeing began to develop the B-47 bomber and Raytheon the Sparrow and Hawk missiles which have kept it going to this day. (\$100 million is included in this year's budget for Hawks.) The full impact of these decisions was obscured by the Korean War. After the peak of that war the defense budget has never fallen below \$40 billion. (In 1950 it was \$14 billion.)

These projects were followed by others in expensive succession. For Boeing, the Minuteman followed the B-52 strategic bomber, which followed the B-47. Between 1952 and 1973 Newport News's yards have produced no fewer than seven carriers, each bigger and better than the last, bow to stern, in the best follow-on tradition. Lockheed developed a notorious (for cost over-runs and allied misfortunes) series of heavy transport planes; the most recent being the C-5A.

The idea that each weapons system must have a follow-on has become self-perpetuating. Each corporation has a planning group whose sole function is to choose suitable successors for weapons currently being produced and which maintains close contact with consorts in the military. The planning procedure is supposed to be an exercise in prediction. In actual fact, because of the intimate relationship with the armed services it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Even so the system has not worked smoothly, and it has taken periodic industrial crises to initiate the full range of new projects.

The first wave of weapons production after the Second World War began to subside in the late Fifties. In the resulting trough a plethora of new projects was introduced, hence promoting the difficulties experienced by Kennedy and McNamara when they made some efforts to control defense spending in the early Sixties.

To soothe those appalled by such expenditure the Pentagon applies a salve called the High-Low Mix: the addition to many expensive projects of many relatively "cheap" projects. This satisfies defeated competitors for the big contracts and gives congressmen a saucy whiff of military parsimony. The Narwhal submarine and the Strategic cruise missile fit this category as does the A-10 close air support aircraft, which costs \$270 million.

Of course the Procurement and the R&D appropriations are not the only items in the budget. They jointly account for 30 percent of it. But a weapons system means much more than just its acquisition cost. It takes fifty men, for instance, to make up a field organization to repair and service a single military aircraft. The cost of a submarine will be multiplied several times over in repair and overhaul costs during its lifetime. Every new generation of weapons costs more and more to maintain. This is the reason why the Operation and Maintenance budget increased 10 percent this year. And then we must not forget the sailors and the pilots and the planners. For the air force and navy "force structures"—the term used to indicate the composition, size, and hierarchy of various sections of the armed forces—are built around particular weapons systems. (The army presents a different case since numbers of men or numbers of combat troops determine the size of the Procurement budget. But naturally the army has to keep in step with navy and air force budgetary victories. So this year it gets an extra third of a division.)

Students of bureaucratic politics, it should be noted, are not happy with the argument for the potency of industrial requirements. The B-1, they say, was ordered to maintain strategic bombing missions for the air force: the air force's manifest destiny is to bomb. But such an answer fails to take into account the requirements of the defense industry—the fact that arms companies must go on producing bigger and better weapons if they are to survive. It fails to explain why the useful life of a weapons system should correspond so aptly to the manufacturing cycle of weapons systems, or why armed services should prefer fewer and larger weapons when more weapons would maintain a larger force structure.

Bureaucratic politics is merely the medium through which industrial competition reaches the highest levels of government. The intense

battle to maintain force structures is in fact an industrial battle, since the maintenance of a particular military function—such as strategic bombing—supports a whole host of weapons systems, which in turn keep the industry alive. Grumman is a navy corporation; Boeing is an air force corporation. Competition between them, based on different "capabilities," gets translated into interservice rivalry ostensibly about differing weapons specifications. This in turn appears before the public as arguments about strategic doctrine.

Another way to see the irrelevancy of strategic doctrine is to note that supposedly gigantic changes in world politics have little or no influence on the habits of the military bureaucracy. What greater change than from cold war to détente—from "the era of confrontation to the era of negotiation?" And yet no one's job is threatened—changes should not be allowed to go that far. To quote Ms. Kaldor and Mr. Cockburn again:

The SALT agreements are being negotiated to institutionalize the arms race. So far as military expenditure is concerned SALT is a prop rather than an axe. Indeed SALT opens up an immense vista of bargaining chips to be acquired. The public is supposed to believe—in so far as it can bring itself to read about SALT at all—that the Administration is making progress toward a safer world (or that, per contra, only the vigilance of Scoop Jackson is saving the country from unprotected prostration). Such illusions and disputes do not inflict any damage on the \$90 billion defense budget. "Advances" or "setbacks" in political détente have no effect on the growth of the world military arsenals. These have a momentum of their own and keep on growing.

But the best way to understand the real causes of military spending decisions is to stand back for a second from current arguments over specific weapon systems and observe the overall pattern of military spending in historical perspective. If we take the trouble to do this, we note a remarkable coincidence between new weapons systems and the times when large military industries are looking for something to do. This is the real meaning of the "follow-on." To quote again:

The idea that each weapons system must have a follow-on has become self-perpetuating. Each corporation has a planning group whose soul function is to choose suitable successors for weapons currently being produced and which maintains close contact with consorts in the military. The planning procedure is supposed to be an exercise in prediction. In actual fact, because of the intimate relationship with the armed services it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Even so the system has not worked smoothly, and it has taken periodic industrial crises to initiate the full range of new projects.

## HON. JIM MARTIN'S OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

### HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that I have received a record 22,860 responses from my 1974 opinion questionnaire mailed to Ninth District constituents in April. That tops the previous record of 21,479 returns as well as the 20,644 responses to my 1973 questionnaire.

The questionnaire covered 10 specific topics of national concern, and one general question allowing respondents to list the major national issues as they see them.

Of nearly 23,000 responses to the questionnaire, 25 percent listed inflation and the cost of living as the No. 1 national issue. That was followed by the energy crisis and fuel shortages.

Watergate and impeachment were listed as the No. 3 national issue by questionnaire respondents, including both supporters and critics of the President.

Busing was listed as the fourth ranked national issue, followed by honesty in government—other than Watergate—crime and drug abuse, and concern with Federal spending and big government.

The No. 1 discussion topic today is the question of impeaching President Nixon. I have taken the position that Members of Congress should wait until all the evidence is presented on the floor of the House before making any judgment about the President's guilt or innocence. This position would seem to be reflected in the questionnaire returns, with 55 percent of the people saying the President should not be impeached based on the accusations against him and his responses to them; 32 percent said they favor impeachment and 12 percent said they were undecided on the issue. While my mail has predominately favored impeachment, responses to the questionnaire are almost 2-to-1 against it.

The question regarding wage-price controls also generated a mixed reaction, with 50 percent calling for an end to controls, and 33 percent in favor of retaining them.

On questions covering reduction of the Federal Budget to curb deficit spending, respondents said they want to see social programs cut. The margin on this issue

was better than 3-to-1. As for defense programs, 41 percent of the people favored spending reductions in this sector, while 35 percent opposed defense budget cuts. A clear majority—55 percent—said they were flatly opposed to any tax increase to balance the budget. However, 28 percent said they were undecided on this issue.

We had several very timely questions on fuel and energy subjects. Seventy-six percent of the respondents said they believe fuel supplies can be increased to meet our needs without further price increases, and they said they favor legislation requiring oil companies to make disclosures about their profits, reserves, and stockpiles. The only other measure favored against the oil companies, however, was an "excess profits" tax. Overall, there seemed to be a general skepticism about the authenticity of the gasoline shortages. My own study, as I have reported before, convinces me the shortage is real and will affect us for decades to come.

A sizable majority of respondents—better than 2 to 1—were opposed to Federal tax funds being used to help finance Presidential and congressional elections. By a margin of 5 to 1, those returning the questionnaires said they were opposed to Government employee strikes.

One question on busing was identical in wording to the 1973 questionnaire. Of those responding, 76 percent favor the constitutional amendment to prohibit forced busing, essentially repeating the 78 percent support of 1973.

Another subject repeated from 1973 was amnesty, but with a changed context. A year ago, only one respondent in five favored unconditional amnesty for draft dodgers. Now, two out of five will support amnesty, conditional upon some alternate public service.

This questionnaire has been very valuable, keeping me abreast of the thinking of the people of the Ninth District. It has been a valid way to gage the opinions of constituents, offering everyone a chance to register his or her attitudes without having to be represented by a small random sample.

While I must personally weigh the merits and demerits of each bill in deciding how to vote on it, taking into account any amendments accompanying the measure to the floor, it is helpful to have the thinking of the people I represent. So I thank all those who took the time to share their views with me on these key issues.

The questionnaire follows:

#### CONGRESSMAN JIM MARTIN'S OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE [In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided		Yes	No	Undecided
1. Impeachment: On the basis of accusations against President Nixon and his responses to them, do you favor his impeachment?	32	55	12	6. Federal budget: The new Federal budget shows a deficit of \$9,000,000,000. To cut this deficit spending, do you favor—	41	35	24
2. Wage-price controls: Do you believe that wage-price controls should be continued?	33	50	18	Reducing social programs?	60	21	19
3. Fuel supply: Do you believe that fuel supplies can be increased to meet our needs without further price increases?	78	11	12	Increasing taxes if budget cuts are insufficient?	16	55	28
4. Energy information: Do you favor legislation requiring oil companies to disclose their profits, reserves and stockpiles?	76	11	12	7. Campaign funding: Should Presidential and congressional campaigns be financed by Federal tax funds?	26	59	15
5. Energy controls: In dealing with the energy crisis, do you favor—				8. Government strikes: Do you favor legislation that would give Government employees the right to strike?	14	72	14
Less Government controls?	37	29	34	9. Amnesty: Should those men who left the country to avoid military service be granted amnesty if they perform public service jobs for 2 years?	38	54	8
More Government controls?	32	33	35	10. Busing: Do you favor a constitutional amendment which would prohibit the busing of schoolchildren to achieve a racial balance?	76	14	10
Nationalizing oil and gas?	16	45	39				
Gasoline rationing (coupons)?	13	53	34				
An excess profits tax?	51	21	28				

# PAUL DUKE JOINS PUBLIC TELEVISION

## HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, Paul Duke, former NBS News congressional correspondent, recently joined the National Public Affairs Center for Television as its Washington correspondent.

Paul Duke has long been a familiar and highly respected journalist on Capitol Hill, and I know that public television will benefit enormously from his wide experience and demonstrated ability.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record a statement issued by the National Public Affairs Center for Television on the occasion of Mr. Duke's appointment.

The statement follows:

PAUL DUKE: NPACT CORRESPONDENT

Paul Duke is the new correspondent for public television in Washington. He assumed his new position earlier this year after 17 years of monitoring the federal government and its activities.

A seasoned political reporter, Duke first came to the capital in 1957 as a reporter with the Associated Press. He joined the staff of the Wall Street Journal in 1959, covering Congress, and in 1966 became Congressional correspondent for NBC news.

While with NBC, Mr. Duke appeared frequently on "Today," "Meet the Press," "NBC Nightly News," and various NBC news specials. He has taken an active part in election coverage every year since 1960, and was a member of the NBC reporting team at the national political conventions in 1964, 1968, and 1972.

As correspondent for the National Public Affairs Center for Television, Duke is moderator of NPACT's critically acclaimed weekly news analysis series Washington Week in Review and interviews leading government figures and other newsmakers on the weekly Washington Straight Talk series.

He also reports regularly on major issues for Washington Connection, a new series designed to emphasize the impact of the federal government on the everyday lives of Americans.

His many contacts on Capitol Hill have enabled him to score a number of beats on important stories. He was the first reporter to predict that L. Patrick Gray 3d, acting director of the FBI, was in trouble in the Senate and might not be confirmed as FBI chief. He was the first to report that George McGovern was ready to drop Thomas Eagleton as his running mate in 1972, and first to report that McGovern had decided on Sargent Shriver as the new Vice Presidential nominee.

Paul Duke's understanding of the American political system and his concise, revealing reporting have earned him the esteem of political figures, fellow journalists, and the American public. He was honored last year by Virginia's Governor Linwood Holton at a state dinner for 34 distinguished Virginians who have achieved success in the arts, theatre, music, and scholarship. In May of 1973, he was presented with an honorary Doctor of Letters degree from the University of Richmond.

Mr. Duke was cited as among the most respected television journalists for fairness and objectivity in a 1970 poll on fairness in

television news conducted at the University of Missouri School of Journalism.

Duke, 47, is a graduate of the University of Richmond, where he received a B.A. in English in 1948. He lives with his wife, the former Janet Johnston, and their 11-year-old son in Bethesda, Md.

## EULOGY OF DUKE ELLINGTON

### HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of the House the death of the world-renowned musician, composer and arranger, Edward Kennedy "Duke" Ellington, whose talents rendered him a giant in the popular music world over a period of almost half a century.

There are many things to say in behalf of Duke Ellington's kind of music. But one was simply its unique quality. He was truly one of a kind, with that special sound which nobody else could master. In passing on, he leaves a legacy of beauty unmatched in the rich traditions of American culture.

The history of American jazz music goes back a mite further than the life of Duke Ellington, but not by very much. The first New Orleans jazz band to be so designated was that of the legendary coronetist Buddy Bolden, who did not attract attention outside his own neighborhood until about 12 years preceding Ellington's birth in Washington, D.C., in 1899.

By the time Duke Ellington was 20 he was a bandleader in Washington, looking for a chance at the big time in New York. In 1923 he arranged the first New York job for his band and was soon on his way to prominence as a broadcasting and recording artist, during extended engagements at Barron's, in Harlem, and the Kentucky Club at Broadway and 49th. Late in 1927 he was signed for what became a successful 5-year run at Harlem's famed Cotton Club.

The growing popularity of radio in the thirties worked to Ellington's advantage during his association with the Cotton Club, and the influence of the phonograph rendered him a star in England and Europe, as well as in America. His first European tour, in 1933, was a thunderous success, and upon his return he and his band were signed to perform in several moving pictures.

The coming of the swing music era of the mid-thirties permitted others such as Benny Goodman, Count Basie, Artie Shaw, and Tommy Dorsey to challenge Ellington as the outstanding dance band leader in the country. But when the swing craze faded in the early forties, to the disadvantage of the others, Ellington survived, even surging to new heights, once again attracting international attention.

It was the nature of Duke Ellington to elicit the loyalty of his musicians, and to maintain the same personnel, with only slight variation, over many, many

years. Such great jazz names as Johnny Hodges, Ben Webster, Joe Nanton, Harry Carney, Rex Stewart, Lawrence Brown, and Sonny Greer were associated with Ellington through most of the 1920's, the 30's, the 40's, the 50's, and the 60's. Charles "Cootie" Williams, who rose to fame with Ellington in the 1930's, had his own band for quite a spell, but 12 years ago returned to the Ellington corral, and was there at the finish. Harry Carney, the greatest baritone saxophone player in jazz history, was the mainstay of the Ellington reed section all the way, from 1926 to 1974. The loyalty of leadership to personnel and personnel to leadership was a matter of the greatest musical significance.

As he had capitalized on the radio for publicity purposes, in the early days of its existence, Ellington also was to capitalize on the phonograph record, above and beyond all other jazz musicians. Signed always to play for one of the several major recording companies, he permitted and encouraged his talented sidemen to record on their own, for whatever company was interested. As a result, the hundreds of records released under Ellington's name are matched in brilliance and musical importance by those released under the names of Johnny Hodges, Cootie Williams, Rex Stewart, and Barney Bigard, accompanied by Ellington personnel.

Throughout the course of his career, Duke Ellington performed in recording studios more than 300 times and produced nearly 1,500 record sides or tracks, not counting alternate masters, unissued sides and the recordings of his sidemen—in which the Duke was frequently engaged, on piano—and not counting hundreds of records and tapes made at concerts or dances. What is even more astonishing is that a large majority of these recordings comprised his own compositions. In terms of mere numbers, Ellington rates alongside two other prolific musical creators, Johann Sebastian Bach and Heitor Villa-Lobos.

Mere quantity is hardly the distinguishing factor, however. It is the quality that matters—the quality of these thousands of Ellington recordings; the countless musical innovations embodied in them; the music that remains, indelibly imbedded in our memories.

Perhaps no recording artist associated with the jazz music tradition was responsible for so many unique musical cameos and vignettes, defying imitation and repetition. Each Ellington recording has a way of creating its own musical universe, never to be duplicated. For the jazz musician, the release of the phonograph record is tantamount to publication. And as the most published musician of his time, in this sense, Ellington fulfilled his heart's purpose to the hilt.

In the area of live performance, Ellington was to encounter the same problems as his fellow big-band leaders in the entertainment world—the demise of vaudeville and the theater stage-show, the rise of the vocal soloist as the main staple of nightclub entertainment, the long success of small-band rock and roll, and the virtual disappearance of the fox-trot from the dance hall scene.

In the 1950's, when popular interest in big dance bands dropped so low that all but a handful gave up completely, or took to working on a part-time basis, Ellington kept going, despite the financial gamble involved.

From 1956 to 1971 he and his band toured the four corners of the world, performing in the Middle East, the Far East, and the Soviet Union under the auspices of the U.S. State Department, as well as Africa, South America, and Europe. In many engagements on these various foreign ventures the orchestra was booked in the great concert halls, exactly the same as if it were a 15-piece innovation of the symphony orchestra, which in a sense it was.

As a composer, Ellington was responsible for more than 1,500 pieces of music, ranging from popular standards such as "Do Nothing Till You Hear From Me," "Sophisticated Lady," "Don't Get Around Much Any More," and "Satin Doll," to moving-picture themes, ballet, classical, and sacred music.

Name your musical category, Duke Ellington was its leader. In the words of composer and conductor Leonard Bernstein:

The Duke was not only a remarkable composer and performer, but was in himself a significant chapter in the history of American music.

Because of its beginning in the world of saloons, and slums, jazz music took a long time acquiring respectability and acceptance, as did also jazz musicians and composers.

Final acceptance came late in life to Duke Ellington, but not too late for him to enjoy it. He was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1969 and the French Legion of Honor in 1973.

He is gone now, and will do no more creating. The vibrant genius of his life is stilled at least. Unlike most of us, however, he has been able to leave a portion of his genius for posterity—the vastness of his recorded works and his published songs which will charm and thrill the music lovers of the world for centuries to come.

#### NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE AND HEALTH CARE DELIVERY

### HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is presently conducting hearings on national health insurance. The debate which is taking place is of crucial importance for all Americans.

In fiscal 1973, this Nation spent \$94.1 billion for health and medical care—3½ times the amount spent in 1960 and almost 8 times the amount spent in 1950. The average health bill for each American increased 300 percent over the average health bill in 1960 and increased more than 500 percent over the amount in 1950.

Although there has been a significant growth in voluntary health insurance in the United States since World War II,

only about four-fifths of the population under age 65 had either hospital or surgical health insurance or both at the end of 1972. The percentages were lower for nonhospital-associated health care—176 percent were covered for X-ray and laboratory examinations, 51 percent for office and home visits, 58 percent for out-of-hospital prescription drugs, 21.5 percent for nursing home care, and 9.5 percent for dental care.

In fact, about 20 percent of the civilian population under age 65—representing some 38 million persons—were still wholly unprotected in 1972. Disproportionate numbers of these were children and the poor. The lower a person's family income, the less likely he is to have health insurance.

Finally, even those persons with insurance coverage incur significant out-of-pocket health expenses. Although such expenses vary substantially by age, when all ages are summarized together, the average personal health care bill in fiscal 1973 was \$375 per person. Individuals paid directly \$132 or 35 percent of this amount. The remainder was paid by private health insurance, \$96 or 26 percent; philanthropy and industry, \$5 or 1 percent; and the Government, \$142 or 38 percent.

In light of these facts, it is apparent that any national health program enacted by the Congress and signed into law must satisfy certain goals. Accordingly, such a program should:

Insure the availability and accessibility of high quality, comprehensive health care;

Protect the traditional rights of free choice of patient and physician;

Provide for universal financial access to health care;

Establish a uniform standard of benefits;

Provide effective measures to control the quality and cost of health care;

Insure against an unnecessarily large and cumbersome bureaucracy; and

Make provision for the reform of the health care delivery system.

The full cooperation of the administration, the Congress, persons, and organizations directly involved in the provision of health care, and other interested parties will be required to insure that these ends are achieved. Moreover, in order to accomplish this, I believe that an effort must be made to preserve that which is good in our present health care delivery system. But, at the same time, we must not be afraid to modify that system to insure the satisfaction of these goals.

#### THE PROPOSALS

Twelve major health insurance proposals have been introduced thus far. All of them incorporate varying degrees of coverage; some set up new mechanisms or bureaucracies for administration, others offer only an extension of ongoing health programs. Of the 12, the administration's bill, the Kennedy-Griffiths bill, the Kennedy-Mills compromise, and the Long-Ribicoff catastrophic measure have received primary attention.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION'S BILL—CHIP

The comprehensive health insurance program, CHIP, developed and supported

by the Nixon administration, will not accomplish the goals I outlined above. Under CHIP, with the exception of medicare, eligibility would change with changes in employment status, income, health risk, and State residence. There would be no uniform program providing the same benefits for all persons. As a result, it is likely that, because of the complexity of the program, less-educated, low-income persons would "fall through the cracks" and end up with no health insurance coverage.

CHIP incorporates three separate plans to provide for comprehensive coverage: a modified medicare plan, covering the aged; a mandated employee health insurance plan—EHIP—covering the majority of the Nation's population, and offered through the place of employment; and the assisted health insurance plan—AHIP—designed for lower-income persons and those not covered under EHIP.

Under the modified medicare program, cost sharing or out-of-pocket expenses would increase—particularly for hospital coverage. In addition, coverage under medicare for low-income persons would be income related.

The requirements of the employer health insurance program, which would mandate the purchase of health insurance by employers, would result in a significant increase in costs for small, marginal, and low-wage employers, despite a Federal subsidy, which would decline in amount over the first 5 years. The burden upon employers would be such that they would make it more difficult for low-income heads of families to obtain regular full-time employment. Employers would prefer employees who would elect to do without health insurance coverage; ineligible part-time rather than full-time workers; single persons rather than heads of families; and temporary rather than full-time help.

Under the assisted health insurance program, there would not be one uniform, Federal program. Instead, a series of State programs would be established under Federal standards and guidelines. In addition, although AHIP would replace medicaid, it would reduce benefits for some and would increase cost sharing, which would serve as a deterrent, for others.

Finally, of critical concern, is the fact that CHIP would rely heavily upon private health insurance carriers—an industry whose track record certainly leaves much to be desired. The private insurance industry's administrative costs and profits have increased by 120 percent over the last 4 years, but the Nixon administration's proposal makes no specific provision for the regulation of the industry. Indeed, under CHIP, responsibility for the administration and regulation of the program—including private health insurance carriers—would fall to the States.

#### THE KENNEDY-GRIFFITHS BILL

The Health Security Act, introduced by Senator KENNEDY and Congresswoman GRIFFITHS, is the most comprehensive of the various measures being considered. Virtually everyone would be eligible for benefits, which cover the en-

tire range of health services offered today. A major plus for the Kennedy-Griffiths bill is that it would provide a manpower support program, as well as financial incentives for physicians and other health care practitioners, for practicing in rural or ghetto areas. This is a provision which is sorely lacking in the other major proposals but which should be a primary consideration.

The very scope of the Kennedy-Griffiths legislation, however, prevents it from being seriously considered at present. The universal coverage of the bill provides that rich and poor alike are eligible for the identical care, without basis of financial need. Yet no provision is included for coinsurance or deductibles. Such features are necessary cost controllers and help guard against overutilization; they should be part of any comprehensive national health program.

One basic problem is its exorbitant cost. This would be approximately \$67 billion, controlled in a health security trust fund and funded by a social security tax of 3.5 percent on the employer and a 1-percent tax on the first \$15,000 income of the employee. With projections of an increasing social security tax burden, we ought to move cautiously in considering an additional tax of this nature.

Lastly, coupled with this cost factor is the administrative problem inherent in this bill. The Health Security Act proposes a multilevel bureaucracy, housed within HEW, to administer the program. One needs only to look at the present social security system, with its constant administrative problems, to see what roadblocks could be encountered. I do not think this is a realistic approach.

#### THE COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE ACT OF 1974

This national health insurance program was recently introduced jointly by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY and Congressman WILBUR MILLS in the spirit of a compromise. It is an attempt to incorporate what they consider the best aspects of all of the proposals presently before the Congress, and is designed to avoid many of the problems which would be created by the adoption of the Nixon administration proposal.

There are two major, controversial portions of this legislation which will require careful consideration, however. First, it places the primary responsibility for the administration and regulation of national health insurance upon the shoulders of the Federal Government. This could prove to be the least effective and efficient of the proposals for administration, and should be thoroughly scrutinized. And second, the proposed financing mechanism is a 3-percent tax on employers' payrolls, 1 percent on employees earnings, 2.5 percent on income of the self-employed, and a 2.5 percent tax on unearned income. The tax base for all individuals and employers, as proposed, would be \$20,000. With the majority of the American population already heavily burdened by the ever-increasing social security tax, we should move cautiously when considering this additional tax.

#### THE CATASTROPHIC HEALTH INSURANCE AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE REFORM ACT

Better known as the Long-Ribicoff proposal, this would offer protection against the biggest of all health care costs, the catastrophe. It also would make available a standardized private health insurance policy for the poor. Unfortunately, this measure offers little relief for the widest spectra of health care recipients, and should be viewed, therefore, as only a first step to a comprehensive national health insurance program.

#### ADEQUATE HEALTH CARE DELIVERY RESOURCES

The focus on national health insurance has diverted attention away from the further development of our health care delivery system. It must be made clear to the American people, however, that ensuring that all persons will be able to afford health care through the enactment of national health insurance does not necessarily mean that high quality, comprehensive health care services will be available and accessible throughout the Nation.

The Nixon administration recently has announced a cutback in support for Federal manpower programs. This is being done, it is explained, because of the rapid increase in the numbers of trained physicians. However, although this may be true in some specialized fields, it is most certainly not true generally, and the Federal Government must continue to support the existing health manpower programs, and increase them.

This need is evidenced by the ever-increasing reliance upon foreign physicians. In 1972, there were nearly 70,000 foreign medical graduates practicing in the United States, comprising 20 percent of our active physician population. One out of every five active physicians was a graduate of a foreign medical school, and for interns the proportion was considerably higher.

Since 1950, the total number of professionally active physicians has increased by more than 100,000, or approximately 54 percent. In terms of doctors per 100,000 persons, the rate has risen from 140 in 1950 to 156 in 1972. But, the proportion of all active physicians providing patient care in office-based practice has been decreasing in recent years, from 109 per 100,000 population in 1950 to 95 in 1972.

In addition, the number of physicians per population unit providing patient care varies enormously throughout the country. For every 100,000 persons in South Dakota, for example, there are only 71 physicians providing family care. In other words, each physician there serves nearly 1,200 people. In New York, the rate per 100,000 is 198 or only 500 persons per physician. Even within States with high physician population ratios, many areas suffer from a physician shortage. Persons in low income and rural areas find the number of physicians much lower than the State average, and are most seriously affected by the maldistribution of health care practitioners.

Clearly, further emphasis, and support, must be provided, to encourage young doctors to enter the practice of family medicine. Likewise, further emphasis and support is required for the encouragement of participation of other primary health care practitioners and allied health professionals in rural health care delivery. In addition, there is an ongoing need for the training of physicians assistants, such as the MEDEX program and the nurse-practitioners' programs at the University of Utah, where physician's assistants are trained in the delivery of primary medical care in rural areas. And we must begin to set priorities for the funding of health research and outreach programs, to insure that adequate funds are made available for comprehensive outreach work and research in rural areas.

Finally, new concepts and mechanisms must be developed to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery of health care services. In this regard, the Congress recently passed the Health Maintenance Organization Act of 1973. I was extremely pleased, of course, when the Congress, recognizing a growing need for the development of prepaid health care plans, took action to formalize the Federal Government's support of this relatively new approach to health care delivery.

Unfortunately, the act, as finally approved by the Congress and signed into law, includes several aspects which raise significant problems for organizations interested in forming or aiding in the formation of HMOs. Thus, although drafted with the intent of insuring the availability of high quality, comprehensive health care services, there is substantial doubt as to the impact it will have on the development and operation of HMOs. Aside from the overall limitations on Federal funding, the minimum health services, and open enrollment requirements alone will make it extremely difficult, in many circumstances, for qualified HMOs to compete with private insurance carriers and Blue Cross-Blue Shield.

Nevertheless, the act was the result of an effort, which must continue, aimed at improving the delivery of health care services. It is a step forward in committing the Federal Government to a more orderly health care system designed to serve all Americans.

Over the next several years, it can be expected that the Federal Government will take the next step forward through the enactment of some form of national health insurance. The impact which such a program will have on those individuals who do not have access to health care services remains unclear. The challenge which is now presented—both to the Federal Government as well as the private sector—is how best to deal with the rush of events in the health care field so as to insure the development of both meaningful information and institutional structures that will be useful in the evolutionary process of developing more orderly health care delivery systems.

# NEW LIVER CANCER CASES WIDEN FEARS ON VINYL CHLORIDE HAZARD

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming uncomfortably evident that the first frightening reports about cancer caused by exposure to vinyl chloride may have underestimated the seriousness of the problem.

What is especially terrifying is that we are becoming aware of the effects this chemical has on human health only after it has been in production in this country for nearly 30 years and only because it causes, among other things, an extremely rare form of liver cancer.

Had this chemical been responsible for a more common disease, such as lung cancer, its effects, in all probability, would not have been recognized for a number of years to come.

How many of the 3,000 new chemicals which will be synthesized in the United States this year will have a similar effect on human health?

Will it be 20 or 30 years before we learn which are deadly?

Will those chemicals that are toxic be ones to which only a small portion of the population is exposed or will they be chemicals that have found their way into the bloodstreams of all Americans?

These are questions which no one can answer.

The following article from the New York Times indicates the growing fear of researchers that the vinyl chloride danger may extend beyond those workers involved in the manufacture of plastic resin to the hundreds of thousands of workers who turn the resin into consumer products, and even to individuals who live in the vicinity of vinyl chloride plants.

## NEW LIVER CANCER CASES WIDEN FEARS ON VINYL CHLORIDE HAZARD

(By Jane E. Brody)

Four new cases of angiosarcoma of the liver have just been uncovered. They raise for the first time the possibility in the minds of public health officials that this fatal cancer hazard that has been linked to vinyl chloride may extend to hundreds of thousands of workers and to members of the general public.

Heretofore, the cancer risk associated with vinyl chloride, a basic chemical in the plastics industry, has been confined to the approximately 6,500 American workers who make vinyl chloride or convert the chemical to its polymer, polyvinyl chloride. Since January, when the hazard was first revealed, 19 cases of this invariably fatal cancer, which is extremely rare in the general population, have been uncovered among vinyl chloride workers here and abroad.

Among the newly revealed cases of angiosarcoma of the liver—three in New York State and one in Connecticut—are a worker who for 30 years made electrical wire insulation from polyvinyl chloride resin and a woman who for nearly 30 years lived four blocks downwind from a polyvinyl chloride manufacturing plant.

Public health officials are currently intensively investigating these cases because of their potential implication of a much more widespread hazard than previously suspected.

### WORKING FORCE

Although precise numbers are not known, informed sources estimated that hundreds of thousands of workers are engaged in the processing of polyvinyl chloride, generally known as PVC, into countless consumer and industrial products, including paints, furniture, floor tiles, clothing, food packages, dentures, garden hoses, pharmaceutical products, construction pipes and insulation.

In addition, countless individuals with no occupational exposure to vinyl chloride or its polymer live in the vicinity of the 14 plants that make vinyl chloride and the 35 plants that make PVC.

The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that 300 million pounds of vinyl chloride escape into the environment each year as a result of this manufacture. Yesterday, the agency asked the 27 manufacturers involved to submit "process, emission and air quality data" to help it develop air pollution control standards for vinyl chloride in accordance with the Clean Air Act of 1970.

The agency has detected vinyl chloride up to half a mile from a PVC plant, as well as along a highway in Pasadena, the heart of the largest vinyl chloride producing region in the United States.

Other potential sources of exposure to this chemical have been the dozens of aerosol consumer products, including hair sprays and household pesticides, in which for years vinyl chloride was used as a propellant. Nearly all such products have been recalled in the last month.

### OTHER POTENTIAL SOURCES

The new cases of angiosarcoma of the liver turned up in a search of records of cancer registries in New York State and Connecticut.

The New York registry contains a total of six cases of this disease, all six having lived in the Buffalo area, near where a large Goodyear plant has been making PVC since 1946. There is also a preliminary report of a seventh case in the Buffalo area. Three of the New York cases are men who worked at the Goodyear plant in Niagara Falls, but the other three are all women who had no known occupational exposure.

According to officers at the Center for Disease Control, one of the New York women, who died in January at the age of 62, had lived four blocks southeast of the Goodyear plant since the end of World War II. She also had her hair done each week for at least 20 years, although the beauty salon she patronized told officials they did not use vinyl chloride-containing hair sprays.

### CASE IN CONNECTICUT

The Connecticut registry has accumulated a total of eight cases of angiosarcoma of the liver since 1935. Dr. Barbara Christine, director of the registry, told The New York Times. One of those, a man who died last July at the age of 60, had worked for 39 years at the General Electric plant in Bridgeport.

According to a company spokesman, for the first 30 years of the man's employment, he operated machines that processed plastic ("quite probably PVC"), rubber and other materials into insulation.

The company, which this week notified the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health about the case, has begun medical tests, including liver function studies, of all employees exposed to any known level of vinyl chloride, the spokesman said.

The institute said it was consulting with the company about further studies, and the Center for Disease Control is investigating the other cases in the cancer registry.

Dr. Irving J. Selikoff, director of the Environmental Science Laboratory at Mount Sinai Hospital here, commented that "any one case could be a coincidence and more information is needed to define the precise risk. However, the new cases point to the urgent need for research to clarify the situation."

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I was hospitalized at Bethesda Naval Hospital from June 2 through June 7 for knee surgery. Because of my hospitalization I was not able to vote on any of the roll-calls which came before the House during that period. However, had I been present, I would have cast my votes as follows:

On rollcall No. 261, House Concurrent Resolution 271, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to those missing in action in Southeast Asia, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 262, H.R. 14833, to extend the renegotiation Act of 1951 for 18 months, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 266, Senate Joint Resolution 40, to authorize a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 267, H.R. 13595, to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1975, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 268, S. 2844, to provide for the collection of special use fees at additional Federal recreational areas, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 269, the conference report on H.R. 12565, the Department of Defense Supplemental Authorization for fiscal year 1974, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 270, the conference report on H.R. 14013, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1974, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 271, House Resolution 1152, the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 14747, Sugar Act Amendments, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 272, an amendment to H.R. 14747 deleting South Africa from the sugar quota by 1976, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 273, an amendment to H.R. 14747, adding additional criteria for the Secretary of Agriculture's determination of the minimum wage rates for sugar workers, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 274, an amendment to H.R. 14747, requiring sugar fieldworkers paid at piece rates to receive at least the hourly minimum wage determined by the Secretary of Labor, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 275, on final passage of H.R. 14747, the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 276, a motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 69, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1974, to insist on the House position on busing of students as embodied in title II of H.R. 69, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 278, an amendment to H.R. 15155, Public Works appropriations, to delete \$800,000 appropriated for the Dickey-Lincoln Dam project, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 279, on passage of H.R. 15155, appropriations for public works and the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1975, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 280, an amendment to the Sullivan substitute to H.R. 10701, Public Works appropriations—port facilities, restoring the section on liability funds for damage, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 281, the Sullivan substitute as amended to H.R. 10701, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 282, on final passage of H.R. 10701, relating to public works on rivers and harbors, I would have voted "aye."

#### URBAN DWELLERS SIT BELOW THE SALT

### HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, recently the House was preoccupied with a series of reforms, aimed at restructuring our committee system. There has been much debate on the subject, both pro and con. Numbers of my colleagues have applauded the recent moves of the Democratic caucus in referring the proposal to a committee for more study. Others have condemned the move as antireform. I wish to address myself to one aspect of the proposal with which I take vigorous issue.

Every vested interest in the Nation has a permanent representative in Washington. Lobbyists swarm about Capitol Hill like flies about a discarded bone. You cannot turn anywhere up here on a given measure without bumping into a smooth-talking representative of some special interest or other, often with a laudable goal.

Within the structure of Congress itself, there is an accurate reflection of this situation in the makeup of the committee structure. Virtually every special segment of the Nation has a committee which specializes in their problems. Agriculture, for example, possesses a special committee which deals with rural problems, even though rural people represent approximately 10 percent of the Nation's population. And I find this to be a laudable manner of structuring matters here.

Some interests command committees which constitute a very modest segment of our electorate. But one massive interest, constituting 90 percent of the Nation's people, lacks any special committee in the House of Representatives; I refer of course to urban and suburban dwellers.

America's suburbs are inextricably intertwined with America's inner cities, especially through interlocking housing, transportation, and other social problems. These growing masses of people, however, have no way of specifically presenting their problems, as urban difficulties, to the Congress. They have no way of taking their problems, packaging them as legislation, and taking them to the floor of the House of Representatives. In effect, they are stifled voices, even though they produce the lion's share of America's wealth and pay by far the largest share of our taxes. To a Member from an entirely urban district, such as my own in Brooklyn and Queens, this is the ultimate frustrating experience.

What is compounding the difficulty is the fact that these problems, because they have not been addressed over the years by government on all levels, have grown from sores on the body politic to cancers. Urban frustration and anger is steadily rising and is being focused on Congress. This is as true of suburban America as it is of urban America. Further, tens of millions of citizens are well aware of the fact that the Congress has stifled their calls for initiatives, and has, such as in the case of special attention to their interests, been more than a bit lacking.

We desperately require a standing committee on urban affairs. In this way, the existing fragmentation of responsibility could be eased. By addressing itself to urban problems, congressional attention could be focused on the realities of these growing problems. It could aid the House in updating itself on these questions and the needs of the overwhelming majority of Americans.

Such a committee on urban affairs could have jurisdiction over urban development, housing, urban mass transportation, relocation assistance, and regional planning. Presently, these areas of responsibility are divided up among many different committees, none of which do justice to them, in spite of sincere attempts to do so on the part of all those involved.

Our distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. BADILLO) has stated his intention of offering an amendment to any reform bill which would create such a standing committee on urban affairs. I support that endeavor, and shall do all I can to see to it that the measure is adopted, either as an amendment or as a separate bill.

Certainly we are long past due for some specific attention to city needs, and the urban and suburban bloc of Members of both parties should make the attempt to bring such a committee into being.

#### LAND-USE BILL: IMPLICATIONS FOR LOCAL HOME RULE

### HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, this week we will take up the land use bill,

which is a most profound and far-reaching piece of legislation.

On one hand, it has been characterized as a moderate and well-intentioned effort to assist and encourage improvement of the decisionmaking process in respect to land use, largely from an environmental standpoint.

#### GROUNDWORK FOR CONCERN

On the other, it has been damned as a sinister assault on States' rights and the principle of private ownership of property. This can be attributed in some measure to the language before us, and also to predecessor versions in both this and the other body providing, among other things, sanctions in the form of withholding of highway and other funds to bludgeon the States into compliance, and requirements that States be prepared to ban outright any use of some land. Certainly some of the fears expressed will become a reality if the cross-over sanctions are imposed by amendment on the floor this week or at some time in the future.

Given the history to date of H.R. 10294, there are legitimate grounds for all manner of interpretations. My own view is that the merits of the legislation's objectives are beyond question; indeed, they coincide with a number of objectives I have pursued in a less comprehensive—and more practical—way for some time. The bill's means of achieving those objectives, however, are very much open to question.

#### DANGER TO LOCAL OPTION

What concerns me most is the failure of proponents and opponents alike to confront directly the obvious fact that this bill requires, as a condition for eligibility for assistance provided, that States establish a mechanism empowered to override local government decisions in conflict with State land-use determinations. And not merely in the interests of the environment alone. In decisions affecting economic needs, social needs, energy needs, as well as environmental imperatives, the States must be prepared to override local decisions as either excessively permissive or excessively restrictive. Language in the bill, language in the report, and the representations of groups supporting the bill to the effect that adequate safeguards are provided are totally unresponsive.

Thus this measure is repugnant to the people of New Hampshire, to a solid majority of my constituents in the Second Congressional District and to my own principles.

#### TEST CASE ON RECORD

I doubt that the people of New Hampshire want their land-use decisions made in Concord, N.H., or Washington, D.C. But in any event, the decision should be left to them.

My position grows out of New Hampshire's strong home rule tradition, repeatedly reaffirmed as recently as this year.

Item: Olympic Refineries, Inc., an Onassis subsidiary, proposed to locate an oil refinery on the New Hampshire coast at Durham, a college town where the University of New Hampshire is located. Local opposition was overwhelming. Yet,

in view of New Hampshire's disturbing dependency on oil, there was strong support for creating refining capacity in the State, and support specifically for the Durham location, that being the one concrete proposal at hand. And there were proposals to subject the matter, not to the discretion of Durham, but the entire State by referendum.

In an action rightly regarded as reaffirmation of the home rule principle, the New Hampshire House rejected, on March 7, by a vote of 233-109, a measure to vest the decisionmaking authority in a State energy facilities committee.

Local option clearly was the issue. The general court later went on to pass a refinery siting bill specifically requiring that any location selected be approved by regular or special town meeting in the jurisdiction involved.

#### CONSTITUENT POLL FINDINGS

These experiences also suggest that had this bill before us been in effect, and had New Hampshire established the State-level mechanism to comply, it would at least theoretically have been possible for that agency to have ignored Durham's rejection. This is a clear case, if you will, of a trial run of this bill before us, because on its environmental thrust, this bill cuts both ways.

Item: More recently, in my 12th annual questionnaire to constituents I posed the following question: "Land Use: Do you favor Federal legislation encouraging States to establish overall development policy involving environmental, economic and energy matters, and to override local government decisions which conflict with such policy?"

A systematic sampling of more than 9,000 replies by late last week showed sentiment opposed by nearly 2 to 1. And although the Durham case was not mentioned in my questionnaire, it was cited in the responses.

#### EARLY BACKER REVERSES STAND

Item: An early supporter of the approach embodied in H.R. 10294 was Dr. Gordon J. F. MacDonald, who worked on the administration's version as a member of the President's Council on Environmental Quality from 1970 to 1972. A distinguished environmentalist of undisputed credentials, he since has become Henry R. Luce, third century professor of environmental studies and policy at Dartmouth. Not confining his activities to academic contemplation, however, he has involved himself in land-use efforts at the State and local level in both New Hampshire and Vermont.

He has just written me that, based on his experience, he has become disillusioned with the federally-inspired regulatory approach, with its excessive concentration of power in State government as the locus of decisionmaking. Alternatively, citing the Durham case and other developments, he sees great potential in local units of government in a town meeting, local option State like New Hampshire. Thus, he not only opposed H.R. 10294 in its present form, but has sought to dissuade me from offering home rule amendments as totally insufficient to resolve the problems in the bill. This, I believe, reflects the fact that

the entire bill rests on the assumption that localities are unwilling or unable to make balanced and informed land-use decisions.

#### WALL-TO-WALL DESIGNATION

Consider the bill's practical application to a State like New Hampshire. It would require the State to exercise paramount jurisdiction in decisionmaking concerning major developments and areas of so-called "critical environmental concern." Yet the definitions are so broad, so inclusive, as to embrace virtually the entire State with its areas of farms, timberland and rivers. Note: these are requirements for State assertion of authority.

But the bill also requires that the Secretary of the Interior review designations of critical areas to assure that they include areas considered in his judgment to be of more than statewide concern. With much of the State of New Hampshire adjacent to Federal lands like the White Mountain National Forest or an interstate boundary waterway—the Connecticut River running from the Canadian border to the Massachusetts line and separating Vermont and New Hampshire, a substantial area would be subject to this federally imposed requirement.

This brings me to the assertion of proponents that the American Law Institute, on whose work this bill is partially based, has estimated that only 10 percent of land-use decisions would be subject to the bill's provision as being of more than local concern. This is utterly misleading in New Hampshire's case. The Secretary could mandate more than that even aside from the State's own determination.

#### SAFEGUARDS INADEQUATE

Proponents of this bill may well cite the so-called home rule provisions covering consultation, participation, involvement, comment, and review. They are that and only that and do not alter the locus of final decisionmaking power. To be sure, section 106(c) (2) would permit an appeals procedure for the resolution of conflicts between the State and locality over development or application of the State planning process—a euphemism for a State plan. And it provides that the State must bear the burden of proof. But as to what? That the local actions or decisions are inconsistent with what the State has developed in the first place.

All this, of course, being subject to the Secretary's review and determination that a State, in the words of the Committee report, "has established a comprehensive land-use planning process and is adequately and expeditiously administering it" to remain eligible for Federal support.

The bill, under these provisions, requires all the States to be poured into the same mold, jump through the same hoops, and dance to the same tune, the score for which is laid out in its pages which to me resemble less legislation than prescriptions in the Federal Register. Moreover, I think I know what to expect when CEQ uncorks its guidelines. Frankly, I am anticipating a repeat of our experience with OSHA, or EPA's con-

struction grant guidelines, which the agency admits to having made a hash of.

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE ACHIEVEMENTS

What is disturbing to me is that this is all so contrary to the evolution of guides to growth in New Hampshire. Along with its home rule tradition, we have a genuine concern for the environment. We have a most active and aggressive program in water pollution control. There is a continuing effort by State government and private organizations to preserve and protect New Hampshire's forests. In recognition of development pressures, I have been working for years to assure protection of the scenic and historic values of the Sandwich Notch area. And land use is very much on the public agenda.

Land-use legislation embodying a critical areas approach has been considered by the general court, and a modest initiative passed the Senate last year. A scaled down version failed to pass the House this year. It would be a mistake, however, to gage New Hampshire's desire to improve land-use decision solely by action at the State level—New Hampshire being a home rule State. Individual localities have instituted growth moratoria to afford themselves breathing room to devise sensible and rational criteria for accommodation of growth pressures. Local planning is on the increase, as is establishment and mobilization of increasing numbers of conservation commissions which have both regulatory powers over dredge-and-fill matters and an advisory role in more general land-use questions.

In Plainfield, local government took the initiative in securing a comprehensive soils and resource inventory and then established its moratorium on construction of multifamily dwellings pending preparation of a town land-use plan approved at town meeting.

Citizens in Enfield took advantage of their zoning authority to establish a 10-acre minimum-lot-size conservation district comprising more than one-quarter of the community's area. Many landowners in the affected area supported the measure as an added protection from development which might otherwise detract from the value of their property.

I mentioned conservation commissions earlier. More than 180 New Hampshire towns have adopted provisions under State enabling legislation to establish volunteer agencies of local government specializing in protection of the towns' natural resource base.

I do not suggest for an instant that New Hampshire is coping successfully with all land-use problems. There have been successes and failures. But that is not the real issue. From my perspective in Washington, I would not presume to suggest what arrangements may or should evolve in the State as the decisionmaking process matures. But from my perspective in Washington I am adamant in my insistence that those decisions be ultimately left to the people of the State. The principle problem with this bill is that it seeks to impose one type of solution, one regime for the allocation of critical decisionmaking power, by the numbers.

Not the least of the reasons for being mindful of local prerogatives is the fact that such decisions relating to land use underlie the entire system whereby our communities levy taxes to raise funds for public services and facilities.

#### CONFLICT WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

I am convinced that I am not alone in my concern, particularly when one considers practical effects. The work of the Transportation and Economic Development Subcommittees of the committee is instructive in this respect. No public programs are more decisive in determining land use than development and transportation programs. Yet, in these subcommittees, I have detected a strong reservation on the part of some local governments, multi-jurisdiction sub-state agencies and Members of this body to vest in State government an excessive degree of control over administration of transportation and economic development decisions as affecting the localities. If this bill passes in its current form, I can well imagine the reactions once these widely misunderstood realities sink in. Moreover, we would find a chaotic inconsistency in recognizing local option in some specific programs while insisting on an altogether different state role across the board by this legislation.

Many States apparently are moving toward this type of approach absent Federal incentive. That is and should be the prerogative of all States, including New Hampshire.

The bill provides for funding and performance specifications. It would be far preferable to allow States with wishing to do so to continue their delegation of land-use decisions to the localities and strengthen local capabilities to make informed judgments.

In an unprecedented appeal for legislative restraint and scrupulous regard for the consequences of our actions the Washington Post commented recently on a piece of legislation whose objectives the newspaper endorsed. But the Post questioned the means and the ultimate product of its progress through the legislative mill.

Something which starts out as a good bill, said the editorial, "can emerge as very bad law; good laws, once passed, can be amended; and even sound legislation can create bad precedents."

The subject was not land use, but a question issue which strikes very close to home with our friends in the press: newsmen's shield laws. I think we would do well to take a cue for this caveat and be similarly solicitous of the impact of this bill, which from the standpoint of local government in our constituencies indeed strikes very close to home.

#### PRESIDENT SPEAKS AT NAVAL ACADEMY

**HON. BOB WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday my wife and I were privi-

leged to attend the annual commencement exercises at the Naval Academy in Annapolis.

President Nixon was well received as he gave an outstanding address dealing with foreign policy problems. I include the President's speech as a portion of my remarks:

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE 124TH COMMENCEMENT CEREMONY, U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

Admiral Mack, members of the graduating class of 1974, and all of our very distinguished guests:

As one who served in World War II with great pride in the United States Navy, it is a special honor and privilege for me to participate in this 124th commencement ceremony of the United States Naval Academy. The class of 1974 will face challenges as unique and demanding as any in the long and proud history of the Academy.

In a letter to LaFayette in November of 1781, George Washington wrote, "Without a decisive Naval force, we can do nothing definitive; and with it, everything honorable and glorious."

As Washington well knew, it was the Navy that meant the difference between victory and defeat in America's struggle for independence. It was the Navy that meant the difference in the birth of a Nation.

Today, in a nuclear age, the Navy's role is just as important as it was two centuries ago. For now, when the American continent is no longer an isolated fortress but instead an integral part of a shrinking and a troubled world, a strong American Navy is an indispensable factor in maintaining global peace and global stability.

You are embarking on your careers at a time when America's Armed Forces are making a vital contribution to achieving a goal of fundamental importance to each of us here today, to all Americans, and to all nations of the world: the goal of a lasting peace. This is the goal to which I have personally pledged this Administration since the first day of my Presidency. It is a goal to which American diplomacy is totally committed. And it is a goal that can only be reached when it is backed by American strength and American resolve.

As you set out in your noble voyage as new leaders in the defense of peace, I would like to sketch for you the outline of America's strategy for peace and the important role you will now play in advancing that strategy.

Let us look back a moment to the world in which you have grown to manhood.

When the war ended in Europe and Asia in 1945, America was the only economic and military superpower in the world. Most of Europe and Japan were in ruin—economically exhausted, politically demoralized. Leadership of the whole free world fell on our shoulders, whether we wanted it or not.

Hard as it was, our task at the outset was made easier by our overwhelming material strength and by a strong, unified sense of national purpose.

Around the globe, we, as Americans, committed ourselves to halting the advance of communism, to promoting economic development, and even to encouraging other countries to adopt our economic, political and social ideals.

Simplistic and occasionally misguided as this goal may have been, it was a noble and unselfish goal in its enthusiasm. And despite some mistakes which we came to correct, we in our hearts know—and millions in Europe and Japan and in the developing world know—that America's contribution to mankind in the quarter century after the war was of historic and unprecedented dimensions.

And we can be proud that America was as generous in helping our former enemies as we were in aiding our friends.

During this same period, the face of the world changed more rapidly and dramatically than ever before in the world's history. Fifty-eight newly independent nations joined the world community. The once monolithic Communist bloc was splintered. New centers of power emerged in Europe and in Asia.

American zeal and innocence were tempered during these years, also. The war in Korea, followed by the long war in Vietnam, sapped too much of our national self-confidence and sense of purpose. Our own domestic needs commanded greater attention. And by the late 1960's, our policy of trying to solve everyone's problems all over the world was no longer realistic, nor was it necessary.

America was no longer a giant, towering over the rest of the world with seemingly inexhaustible resources and a nuclear monopoly.

As our overwhelming superiority in power receded, there was a growing threat that we might turn inward, that we might retreat into isolation from our world responsibilities, ignoring the fact that we were, and are still, the greatest force for peace anywhere in the world today.

This threat of a new wave of isolationism, blind to both the lessons of the past and the perils of the future, was, and remains today, one of the greatest potential dangers facing our country.

Because in our era, American isolation could easily lead to global desolation. Whether we like it or not, the alternative to détente is a runaway nuclear arms race, a return to constant confrontation, and a shattering setback to our hopes for building a new structure of peace in the world.

When we came into office in 1969, this Administration faced a more complex, a more challenging and yet in some ways a more promising world situation than that which existed in the post-World War II era.

While we could not and will not abdicate our responsibilities as the most powerful nation in the free world, it was apparent that the time had come to reassess those responsibilities. This was the guiding purpose of the Nixon doctrine, a doctrine which says that those we help to enjoy the benefits of freedom should bear a fair share of the burden of its defense as well.

It was also clear that both pragmatism and moral force had to be the double prongs of any American foreign policy in the new era. A sense of moral purpose is part of our heritage and it is part of the tradition of our foreign policy. Pragmatism, realism and technical efficiency must not be the sole touchstone of our foreign policy. Such a policy would have no roots or inspiration, and could not long elicit positive support from the American people and the Congress, and more important, it would not deserve the respect of the world.

We had to remember, however, that unrealistic idealism could be impractical and potentially dangerous. It could tempt us to forego results that were good because we insisted upon results that were perfect.

A blend of the ideal and the pragmatic in our foreign policy has been especially critical in our approach to the Soviet Union.

The differences between our two systems of life and government are sharp and fundamental. But even as we oppose totalitarianism, we must also keep sight of the hard, cold facts of life in the nuclear age.

Ever since the Soviet Union achieved equality in strategic weapons systems, each confrontation has meant a brush with potential nuclear devastation to all civilized nations. Reductions of tensions, therefore, between us has become the foremost requirement of American foreign policy.

The United States will not retreat from its principles. The leaders of the Soviet Union will not sacrifice theirs. But as we have the valor to defend those principles which divide

us as nations, we must have the vision to seek out those things which unite us as human beings.

Together, we share the capacity to destroy forever our common heritage of four thousand years of civilization. Together, we are moving to ensure that this will not—because it must not—happen.

Slowly and carefully over the past five years, we have worked with the Soviet Union to resolve concrete problems that could deteriorate into military confrontations. And upon these bridges, we are erecting a series of tangible economic and cultural exchanges that will bind us more closely together.

The American people are a great people, the Russian people are a great people. These two great people who work together in war are now learning to work together in peace. Ultimately, we hope, that the United States and the Soviet Union will share equally high stakes in preserving a stable international environment.

The results of this policy have been heartening. The problem of Berlin, where our nations were at sword's point for a quarter of a century, has now been resolved by negotiation. Our two countries have concluded an historic agreement to limit strategic nuclear arms.

We and our allies have engaged the Soviet Union in negotiations on major issues of European security, including a reduction of military forces in Central Europe. We have substantially reduced the risk of direct U.S.-Soviet confrontation in crisis areas. We have reached a series of bilateral cooperative agreements in such areas as health, environment, space, science and technology, as well as trade.

At the Moscow Summit in 1972, our Secretary of the Navy, the Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Navy, signed an agreement on the prevention of incidents on and over the high seas—a code of conduct aimed at eliminating dangerous actions of the cold war era and a code of conduct which has already proved a success.

Over the past five years, we have reached more agreements with the Soviet Union than in the entire postwar period preceding that, and this is a record in which all Americans can take pride.

In keeping with our efforts to bring America's foreign policy into line with modern realities, we have also sought to normalize our relations with the People's Republic of China, where one-fourth of all of the people in the world live, a country with which we shared nothing but confrontation and distrust during a quarter century of cold war.

Beginning with an official dialogue opened in 1971, we have negotiated constructive agreements in the areas of trade and scientific and cultural exchanges. We established liaison offices in our respective capitals last year. We expect further progress in the years ahead.

We have also succeeded, as Admiral Mack has indicated, in ending our military involvement in Vietnam in a manner which gave meaning to the heavy sacrifices we had made and which greatly enhanced the preservation of freedom and stability in Southeast Asia.

One result is that today, the 20 million people of South Vietnam are free to govern themselves, and they are able to defend themselves. An even more important result is that we have proved again that America's word is America's bond.

We have preserved the trust of our allies around the world by demonstrating that we are a reliable partner in the defense of liberty; we have earned the respect of our potential adversaries by demonstrating that we are a reliable partner in the search for peace.

America's unique and essential contribution to peace is nowhere better demonstrated than in the Middle East. The hate and distrust that has for so long poisoned the rela-

tionship between Arabs and Israelis has led to war four times in the last 40 years, and the toll of death and human suffering was immense, while the tension made the Middle East a world tinderbox that could easily draw the United States and the Soviet Union into military confrontation.

The need for a stable solution among the regional parties as well as between the great powers was overwhelmingly urgent.

The October War of last year, while tragic, also presented a unique opportunity. Because for the first time, it was clear to us and clear to the moderate leaders of the Arab world, that a positive American role was indispensable to achieving a permanent settlement in the Middle East. And it was for this reason that I sent Secretary of State Kissinger to the Middle East to offer our good offices in the process of negotiation.

The results, which reflect more than anything else the vision and statesmanship of the leaders of both sides, have been encouraging. An agreement to separate military forces has been implemented on the Egyptian-Israeli front and now a similar accord has been negotiated between Israel and Syria. For the first time in a generation, we are witnessing the beginning of a dialogue between the Arab States and Israel.

Now, the road to a just and lasting and permanent peace in the Mideast is still long and difficult and lies before us. But what seemed to be an insurmountable roadblock on that road has now been removed and we are determined to stay on course until we have reached our goal of a permanent peace in that area. The role of Secretary Kissinger in this process has presented a testament to both his remarkable diplomatic capabilities and to the soundness and integrity of our belief that a lasting structure of peace can—and must—be created.

In surveying the results of our foreign policy, it is ironic to observe that its achievements now threaten to make us victims of our success. In particular, a dangerous misunderstanding has arisen as to just what detente is and what it is not.

Until very recently, the pursuit of detente was not a problem for us in America. We were so engaged in trying to shift international tides away from confrontation toward negotiation that people were generally agreed that the overriding consideration was the establishment of a pattern of peaceful international conduct. But now that so much progress has been made, some take it for granted.

Eloquent appeals are now being made for the United States, through its foreign policy to transform the internal as well as the international behavior of other countries, and especially that of the Soviet Union. This issue sharply poses the dilemma I outlined at the outset. It affects not only our relation with the Soviet Union, but also, our posture toward many nations whose internal systems we totally disagree with, as they do with ours.

Our foreign policy, therefore, must reflect our ideals and it must reflect our purposes. We can never, as Americans, acquiesce in the suppression of human liberties. We must do all that we reasonably can to promote justice and for this reason, we continue to adhere firmly to certain humane principles, not only in appropriate international forums, but also in our private exchanges with other governments—where this can be effective. But we must recognize that we are more faithful to our ideals by being concerned with results and we achieve more results through diplomatic action than through hundreds of eloquent speeches.

But there are limits to what we can do, and we must ask ourselves some very hard questions, questions which I know members of this class have asked themselves many times. What is our capability to change the domestic structure of other nations?

Would a slowdown or reversal of detente help or hurt the position evolution of other social systems? What price—in terms of renewed conflict—are we willing to pay to bring pressure to bear for humane causes?

Not by our choice, but by our capability, our primary concern in foreign policy must be to help influence the international conduct of nations in the world arena. We would not welcome the intervention of other countries in our domestic affairs, and we cannot expect them to be cooperative when we seek to intervene directly in theirs.

We cannot gear our foreign policy to transformation of other societies. In the nuclear age, our first responsibility must be the prevention of a war that could destroy all societies.

We must never lose sight of this fundamental truth of modern, international life. Peace between nations with totally different systems is also a high moral objective.

The concepts of national security, partnership and negotiation with adversaries are the central pillars of the "structure of peace" that this Administration has outlined as its objective.

If a structure of peace is to endure, it must reflect the contributions and reconcile the aspirations of nations. It must be cemented by the shared goal of coexistence and the shared practice of accommodation. It must liberate every nation to realize its destiny free from the threat of war, and it must promote social justice and human dignity.

The structure of peace of which I speak will make possible an era of cooperation in which all nations will apply their separate talents and resources to the solution of problems that beset all mankind—the problems of energy and famine, disease and suffering—problems as old as human history, itself.

It was with this thought in mind that in February we launched an effort to bring together the principal consumer countries to begin working on the problem of equitably meeting the needs of people throughout the world who are faced with the prospect of increasingly scarce resources—in this case, energy.

Out of recognition of the tragedy of human hunger and of the urgent need to apply man's technology cooperatively to its solution, the United States has also called for a United Nations World Food Conference to take place in Rome this fall.

My trip to the Middle East next week will provide an opportunity to explore with the leaders of the nations I shall visit ways in which we can continue our progress toward permanent peace in that area.

And then later this month, on June 27th, I will again journey to Moscow to meet with General Secretary Brezhnev to explore further avenues, further prospects for a lasting peace, not only between the Soviet Union and the United States, but among all nations.

Each of these missions, in a way, is a reflection of America's broader hopes and responsibilities. And I say to you gentlemen, these are hopes and responsibilities each of you will be helping to meet as you journey to your first duty stations.

As long as you do your duty, as long as the people and the Government support you, the America, the country you love and serve will survive.

Today, each one of you become a custodian of a noble tradition of service. As the first class to have begun its studies in the post-Vietnam era, it falls to you to serve in such a way that the graduates who follow you in the years to come will enter a United States Navy that is strong, that is prepared, and is respected, and above all, a Navy and a Nation at honorable peace with all nations in the world.

One hundred seventy years ago, after Nelson's great victory at Trafalgar, Prime Minister William Pitt was honored at a dinner at London's historic Guild Hall. He was hailed

as the savior of Europe. He responded to that toast with a brief speech that has been named by Lord Curzon as one of the three masterpieces of English eloquence.

Listen to his words: "I return you many thanks for the honor you have done me. But no single man will save Europe. England has saved herself by her exertions and will, I trust, save Europe by her example."

Today, 170 years later, we can say, no single nation can save the world, but America can, and will, save herself by her exertions and will, we trust, by our example, save the cause of peace and freedom for the world.

## NEW YORK CITY UNITED HOSPITAL FUND OR NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

### HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, Joseph V. Terenzio is newly elected president of the United Hospital Fund of New York. Mr. Terenzio was formerly commissioner of hospitals in New York City responsible for administering the Nation's second largest hospital system. Because of his significant exposure to the problems confronting urban hospitals and extensive hospital management experience, I thought his testimony last month before the Committee on Ways and Means on pending national health insurance legislation to be of particular interest and am appending it for the interest of our colleagues.

#### STATEMENT OF JOSEPH V. TERENCE

I am Joseph V. Terenzio, President of the United Hospital Fund, 3 East 54th Street, New York City. The Fund is a non-profit organization which for nearly 100 years has been a source of financial assistance and leadership in promoting constructive change and improvement in the financing and delivery of hospital care to fifty-five voluntary hospitals in New York City.

Though I appear here today on behalf of the United Hospital Fund, as a former Commissioner of Hospitals of the City of New York, having responsibility for the operation of the largest non-federal hospital system in the United States, I am sure that what I have to say reflects the views and the interests of those concerned with the delivery of health care and more particularly the operation of hospitals in the metropolitan centers throughout the country.

I do not propose to undertake a detailed commentary on the various bills before the Committee. I intend rather to direct my remarks to three areas which I believe should be given consideration in any legislation finally passed by the Congress. Before I move to these areas, however, I want to make a few general comments on certain matters.

The final determination as to the sources of tax funds involved, whether from general revenues or special tax sources, is most important but it can only be decided by the Congress. I would like to make two points with respect to this.

#### FINANCING OF CARE FOR THE POOR SHOULD BE DRAWN FROM GENERAL REVENUES

First, as a matter of principle I would hope that the financing of benefits for the poor and the near poor would be drawn from general revenues, but placed in a special trust fund. It would be patently unfair to expect the working population to finance such costs

through contributory social security taxes for health insurance.

#### NONTAX DOLLARS ARE ESSENTIAL TO A VIABLE HEALTH SYSTEM

Second, I strongly believe that it would be a mistake to enact a program which totally relies upon tax dollars. A method to insure a continued flow of non-tax dollars into the health system is essential because under-financing is an ever present threat. If the government promises more than can be delivered with the tax dollars available, it is unlikely to reverse itself and the result will inevitably be a reduction in the quantity and quality of care.

Experience abroad has shown that government financed health programs faced with continued increases in costs invariably attempt to bring back a substantial amount of the non-tax dollars into the system. Total reliance on tax dollars alone just will not work.

#### BROAD BASIC BENEFIT COVERAGE IS A FIRST PRIORITY

It is said that four out of five persons have basic protection in the event of common illnesses or injury. That figure is very misleading. The more meaningful statistic is that only 26 percent of the public's total personal health costs are covered by insurance or prepayment. I urge, therefore, as a matter of highest priority, the enactment of a program of broad basic benefits for all. Catastrophic illness benefits should take a lesser priority. They should be built on top of a broad basic benefit program. The hazards facing most of us of a catastrophic illness not covered by broad basic benefits is comparatively small. The enactment of a program of catastrophic illness insurance protection would meet the extraordinary needs of a few, but they would fall completely to meet the needs of the many.

#### BENEFITS MUST ENCOMPASS PREVENTIVE SERVICES AND HEALTH EDUCATION

In addition to broad basic benefits, any benefit package must include provision for health education and preventive health services. If we are to have a health delivery service which we can afford, we must assist individuals to do their utmost to take proper steps, themselves, for preservation of their health. We must provide counseling and other educational activities on nutrition and lead poisoning, on drug abuse and venereal disease. If we are to achieve effective use of our health resources and an efficient health care delivery system, as well as maintain a healthy productive population, we must also provide financing for early screening and diagnosis, preventive dental care and periodic eye and ear examinations.

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company estimates that approximately 600 million man-days are lost annually by American workers due to illness and injury. The company estimates the value of these lost man-days at \$12 billion. Provision of health education and coverage of preventive health services will not, obviously, eliminate illness and injury, but they would likely result in less illness and fewer injuries and less expensive treatment when treatment is needed. Additionally, health education and preventive services would encourage many to be more sensitive to their health needs and take better care of themselves.

#### ONE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM: ONE CLASS OF CARE FOR ALL

Several of the bills before the Committee which I have looked at give great promise of a single nation-wide system of health care guaranteeing one class of care to all Americans; for example the introductory statement accompanying one bill states "the concept of one uniform system for all Americans has been incorporated. It (the Bill) proposes universal coverage. It provides one system for all." Such a promise is really unfounded since

under the terms of all bills under consideration several different nationally financed systems will remain, for example, the V.A. hospital system, the U.S. Public Health Service Hospitals, the Indian Health Service, to name but three.

It can hardly be said that we are moving towards a single nation-wide system when we perpetuate different federal systems with different financing, perhaps with different benefits, perhaps with varied political implications and perhaps with different sources of income. It is unlikely that we can tolerate major variances from one system and the duplication and waste that would result. It is imperative that our goal be to move to one system with one class of care for all Americans. Therefore, I would urge the Congress really "bite this bullet" and undertake to provide for a study with a directive that the advantages and the ways and means of incorporating all such federal systems into one nation-wide health care system providing one class of care for all. However, enactment of National Health Insurance should not be delayed pending this study.

I would like, now, to move, as I indicated previously, to those matters which are of primary concern to all hospitals and especially to those hospitals in the metropolitan centers. These concerns are:

- I. The delivery of care
- II. Adequacy of Provider Reimbursement
- III. The administration of a national health insurance program

#### I. THE DELIVERY OF CARE

Now is the time for the country to really look at its delivery system. It is my belief that the problems of bringing about changes in the system will be very great but regardless of the difficulties, this is the time to face them. I can think of no more unfortunate result than for the Congress to undertake to provide substantial sources of new funds which will be simply channeled into the present system—or non-system as some prefer to call it—which at its best is excellent, but which in too many instances is marginal in what it provides, how it provides it and to whom and at what cost.

#### NHI should serve to revitalize the American Health Care System

The system developed should give assurances that services of equal quality will be made available to those who live in the ghetto areas, to individuals who live in outlying areas and in small communities where obtaining services at all is often very difficult, and to those who need it whenever they live, regardless of their ability to pay.

The system must assure that covered health services will be of consistently high quality, be cost effective, be delivered in a humane, efficient and timely manner.

In New York City we have:

A proliferation of expensive and underutilized open heart units;

Utilization review mechanisms which do not offer sufficiently positive incentive for controlling admissions and length of stays of patients;

Virtually no centralized direction in terms of new program planning;

Comprehensive planning which has largely failed of its desired purpose to date; and

A lack of positive incentives for shared services of all kinds, particularly shared professional services which have such great promise.

New York isn't unique. These are problems encountered in every metropolitan area of the country. Any program of national health insurance enacted by the Congress can and should make a beginning at correcting these inadequacies and inefficiencies in order that high quality cost effective care be achieved.

Too, any legislation enacted must assure that every possible use will be made of outpatient services and that we guard against perpetuating a program whereby our only

solution is to add more hospital beds or more costly inpatient services of all kinds. We have had ample demonstration of the advantages of minimizing, to the fullest extent possible, the use of inpatient facilities and maximizing, as far as we can, the use of other forms of treatment. To sum up—improvements in the delivery of care must lead to:

Care of equal quality for all—regardless of place of residence or economic status;

Care of consistently high quality, which is cost effective and delivered in a humane, efficient and timely manner; and

Care which takes maximum advantage of forms of treatment other than inpatient care.

#### *Standards for Health Care Should Be Established and Enforced*

To achieve these goals, establishment of standards, and of compliance thereto, as a condition precedent to receiving payment should be made a part of health insurance legislation.

Standards to be established in a national health insurance program might require for example, that hospitals:

Submit plans to local comprehensive health planning agencies for approval in order to be eligible for reimbursement for all services they propose to initiate, and those which they wish to continue beyond a certain date, and for all new physical facilities which they propose to build;

Maintain careful control of bed occupancy;

Establish procedures for pre-admission testing to ensure the earliest possible discharge;

Develop and implement staffing mixes which assure economic utilization of manpower;

Offer essential primary care services at times and places convenient and accessible to the public; and

Establish alternative forms of care such as increased amounts of self care, care provided by physicians' assistants in appropriate circumstances, and home care.

Also, to assure the delivery of high quality care in sufficient quantity, it is my belief that the PSRO legislation, already passed by the Congress, should be put into effect as rapidly as possible. Though there is much controversy with respect to PSRO, I believe it provides an enormous opportunity and a great responsibility to the physicians of the country to regulate themselves. I would hope that the PSRO program would be organized so that major attention is paid to the necessity of having well functioning PSRO programs within individual institutions so that the role of the community or area-wide PSRO is largely related to collecting information, to overseeing the efforts made within individual institutions and to assuring that the desired goals are fulfilled. No doubt, as we move along, such review procedures will have to be related to the services offered by physicians in their offices as well.

I have talked about the need to impose standards and controls on the quality of the delivery of care. I want to talk, also, about controlling the costs of health care delivery.

#### *NHI should work to control hospital costs*

There should be a continuing effort to assure that services are provided in the most economical manner. I strongly believe that if major savings are to be developed in the cost of operating health facilities, they will surely come about by improving the manner in which facilities are utilized. To help eliminate avoidable costs and reduce or contain unavoidable costs, any national health insurance legislation, as I suggested earlier, ought to provide coverage for those ambulatory services which often obviate the need for more elaborate and costly inpatient services later on. Much more attention must be paid also, to providing increasingly complex diagnostic procedures and minor surgical

procedures on an ambulatory basis and more extensive use must be made of home health care services.

Though the government has devoted much attention to controlling hospital costs, no doubt equal concern in the future will have to be directed to the control of the costs of professional services.

All such requirements would have a great effect on the total and overall cost of health services to be provided.

#### *A properly designed and administered prospective reimbursement system would provide effective cost containment mechanism*

There has been much question and criticism of the present prevailing method of reimbursing hospitals the "reasonable cost" of such services. This is the mechanism prescribed by law to be used in the Medicare program. To arrive at what has been accepted by the government as "reasonable" has involved complicated and protracted discussions with everyone and has resulted in very costly auditing procedures, and expensive administration. Additionally, this basis of reimbursement has been attacked as being "too open ended" and not sufficiently conducive to the economic administration of hospitals.

In view of these problems, it has been strongly urged for the past several years that government move from retrospectively determined reasonable cost, "to prospective cost reimbursement" whereby a given institution would be reimbursed either on a cost projection or established budget basis deemed necessary to underwriting the cost of its services for a given period of time.

Prospective reimbursement has distinct advantages if administered properly. For example, it can provide incentives for hospitals to voluntarily live within predetermined revenue projections. This may well force hospitals in urban areas to work together to arrive at a more rational distribution of services and facilities through service mergers or consolidations—particularly professional services—and increased emphasis on shared services.

On the other hand, if administered improperly, if used to impose reimbursement levels which fail to take into account the provider's realistic financial needs in the face of an inflationary economy, prospective reimbursement may lead to medical mediocrity and force many voluntary non-profit hospitals into financial insolvency.

As a minimum, therefore, any reimbursement procedure must provide for reimbursement of unexpected escalating costs—for example, increases which result from changes in federal or state laws and regulations, and increased labor and other costs caused by the pressure of an inflationary economy.

#### *II. ADEQUACY OF PROVIDER REIMBURSEMENT*

In determining the adequacy of provider reimbursement, it would be misguided not to assure that the providers of care are adequately reimbursed, and if such assurances are not given, it will definitely prove to be a disservice to the public in the long run.

#### *Adequate reimbursement is essential*

In New York City, demand for ambulatory and emergency services has increased 25 percent since 1967. Yet because 50 percent of the patients seeking hospital outpatient care are ineligible for Medicaid and have no insurance coverage for outpatient care the absolute loss to the City's voluntary hospitals alone this year will approach 60 million dollars—an amount far beyond the reach of these hospitals even with private philanthropy or currently available state and local funds. As a result I am sure that you are aware, in New York City several hospitals are currently faced with receivership.

Hospitals must be reimbursed fairly and adequately to assure their continued ability to serve the public.

#### *III. ADMINISTRATION OF A NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM*

One has only to have even a faint familiarity with the organization and delivery of health care or with the experience of the nation-wide Medicare program to have some comprehension of what is involved in administering a program uniformly and fairly throughout this vast nation.

#### *NHI administration should be a responsibility shared by the Federal Government and by appropriate profit and non-profit organizations*

We have in existence already a large network of administrative talents and experience in the prepayment organizations and certain of the private insurance companies. It should be possible to involve this network of experienced organizations and companies in the administration of a nationwide health program, if the necessary federal standards are established and adequate monitoring is provided. The cost of administration under such a program would surely be less than that likely to result from one nationwide federal program of administration. Furthermore, from an administrator's viewpoint, I would surely have great concern and uncertainty in having to deal exclusively with one enormous federal government bureaucracy.

In Illinois, an artificial kidney program which has been under complete U.S. Medicare financial control for nine months is six to nine months and \$2 million behind in reimbursement of 45 kidney dialysis centers. Some are in danger of closing and the rest have had to borrow.

There are legitimate concerns expressed that if voluntary prepayment organizations and private insurance companies are used in the administration of the basic health care program that the government would in essence be establishing a mechanism which promises to provide very large profits to private enterprise. I am not suggesting such a program at all, but I do believe that such organizations could operate as intermediaries under federal standards which would carefully monitor and limit any profits to be realized.

Earlier I expressed my strong belief in the necessity of a continuing flow of non-tax dollars into the nation's health system. It is also my feeling that deductibles and co-insurance should be a necessary part of the health insurance program so that middle and upper income beneficiaries would be required to support in part their costs for health care. It is possible that a good many individuals in higher income brackets faced with the necessity of such "out of pocket" payments may be unable to finance them and therefore it would seem that the development of insurance programs to cover such costs would be most desirable. Here, in my judgment, is another way to involve further the prepayment organizations and private insurance companies who would, in effect, be adding non-tax dollars into the system.

#### *CONCLUSION*

I believe you will find the hospitals of the nation ready and willing to participate in the development of new systems and approaches which will assure the public receiving the best possible care at the lowest possible cost. A system which envisions the sort of changes needed cannot be made effective immediately or with the passage of national health legislation. Therefore I would hope that the Congress would think through a carefully phased program whereby the health field will be enabled to move step by step to the attainment of goals which we all desire.

With the experience hospitals have had under the Medicare program and the constant frustrations they have faced in the implementation of that program, it is understandable that they may be concerned about committing themselves formally to par-

ticipate as partners with the government in any national health program that does not give reasonable assurance that they will be paid fully for the services they provide.

*Voluntary hospitals are an indispensable component of our health care system*

A substantial majority of the hospitals throughout this nation are voluntary hospitals which since the founding of our country have provided quality care for all citizens regardless of their social or economic status. They are, today, an invaluable health resource. The continued voluntary support of those who believe in their importance to the community have made this possible. A pluralistic health care system comprised of providers with different sources of support and different ways of meeting common health objectives, in my judgment, is indispensable to serving the health needs of Americans both efficiently and humanely in the future. The great voluntary hospitals are an indispensable component of such a system. Their continued viability must, therefore, be assured. Enactment of national health insurance legislation will contribute significantly to attainment of that goal.

I have appreciated the opportunity of meeting with this Committee today and to be able to speak to you with respect to the concerns and interests particularly of the hospitals in the large metropolitan centers of the country.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee I am deeply aware of the extent of the responsibility imposed upon this Committee and I hope that I have in my remarks contributed helpfully to your deliberations.

**HADASSAH PRESIDENT DEPLORES  
MOTHER'S DAY FAILED PURPOSE**

**HON. BELLA S. ABZUG**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, in the 60 years since Congress passed a resolution designating the second Sunday of May as Mother's Day, "to work for the well-being of the home as the fountain-head of the State," this has become one of the Nation's most widely celebrated holidays. It has also, according to the head of the largest women's voluntary organization in the U.S., "degenerated into a celebration of crass commercialism far from the original intent."

Rose E. Matzkin, national president of the 325,000-member Hadassah suggests that Mother's Day is a time to review the condition of mothers in respect to their needs, those of their children and their families. She pinpointed there particular areas:

Sound national health—studies show that the nutrition of the mother influences the genetic development of the children to the third generation. Retardation in infants, caused by malnutrition is irreversible. The United States, the wealthiest nation in the world, does not have the healthiest, best-fed children.

Development of alternatives to the extended family—to provide the mother the support she and her children need throughout the year. This includes day-

care centers, multiservice centers and cooperative living arrangements in new kinds of housing.

Increased education for family planning—so that women may be mothers by choice not by chance and to reduce the number of children born at high risk—birth defects.

The life-giving force is a miracle.

Mrs. Matzkin said:

But what happens to the human product from birth onwards is—for a large part of the world's population—one extended nightmare of rejection, starvation, disease and violence.

I believe that if the women's movement has any meaning, and as the position of women in the world is elevated, they will have to become the effective force for a better society. As the giver of life, that is woman's continuing responsibility.

She concluded:

Perhaps it is time for the women to take over Mother's Day so that next year in Congress a legislative package implementing the 1914 pledge "to work for the well-being of the home" will be presented to America's mothers instead of the bromides and flowers which pass as tribute.

Mrs. Matzkin said that Hadassah, through the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center in Israel, the largest medical complex in the Middle East, has pioneered in public health, mother-and-child care, and social medicine through its support of an extensive network of medical facilities providing healing, teaching and research.

**JOHN F. KENNEDY PEACE FOREST  
IN ISRAEL**

**HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Lynn Sunday Post on May 26, 1974, by a constituent, Anthony Cama. It is concerned with the celebration of Memorial Day and because of its worthwhile nature, I would like to insert it in the Record at this time.

The text follows:

JOHN F. KENNEDY PEACE FOREST IN ISRAEL

(By Anthony Cama)

This is a rather unique story to come forth in the pages of the Sunday Post. It has to do with the creation of a Freedom Forest in Israel to honor the memory of the late President John F. Kennedy. American Jewry associated itself with the government and the people of Israel to pay tribute to the memory of the late beloved President Kennedy, forever linking his name with the land of Israel.

On the hallowed ground where Bar Kochba waged his last gallant battle for Judea's freedom 2000 years ago, the John F. Kennedy Peace Forest has risen within the confines of the America-Israel Freedom Forest, planted by the Jewish National Fund and dedicated to peace and the bonds of friendship that link the two nations.

For the Jews of America, no tribute to our martyred President could be more fitting and enduring than this living symbol of his great-

ness as a champion of peace throughout the world.

The John F. Kennedy Peace Forest epitomizes the hope and inspiration for peace of the people of the United States and Israel, and consists of several million trees that encircle an obelisk similar in design to the Washington Monument, flanked by 50 pylons representing the 50 states of the Union.

Said Levi Eshkol, prime minister of Israel: "The People and the government of Israel will be honored to render tribute to his memory through the establishment of the John F. Kennedy Peace Forest."

In a letter to Max Bressler, president of the Jewish National Fund of America, Prime Minister Eshkol said: "The President John F. Kennedy Peace Forest in Israel's Freedom Forest will serve as a notable tribute to the memory of a great American and a world statesman. With this project you are forging still another link in the chain of projects symbolizing the friendship between the peoples of the United States and Israel."

"As a valiant seeker for peace and the rights of men, your late president was an outstanding example of this enduring friendship. The people and the government will be singularly honored to be associated with this tribute to his everlasting memory."

President Kennedy had stated, "The Jewish National Fund represents one of Zionism's most constructive achievements in human welfare and social development."

**NOTABLE CAREER**

John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the U.S., was born May 29, 1917, in Brookline, Mass. He was the second of nine children of Joseph P. Kennedy, a financier, who later became ambassador to Great Britain, and Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy. He entered the Harvard University, attended the London School of Economics briefly in 1935, received a B.S. cum laude from Harvard in 1940.

He served in the U.S. Navy in 1941-1945, commanded a P. T. boat in the Solomons and won the Navy Cross and the Marine Corps Medal and Purple Heart. He covered the Potsdam Conference and the start of the U.N. at San Francisco for International News Service. He served as a representative in Congress from Mass. '47 to '53, defeated Henry Cabot Lodge for the Senate in 1952, and was reelected in 1958. He nearly won the vice presidential nomination in 1956, and went on to receive the Democratic nomination for President at Los Angeles, July 14, 1960. Kennedy defeated Richard M. Nixon, Republican by the slim margin of 118,550 popular votes and an electoral vote of 303 to 219. He was the first Roman Catholic to be elected president.

On Nov. 22, 1963, Kennedy was assassinated in Dallas, Texas. On Nov. 25th, a national day of mourning, he was buried in Arlington National Cemetery, Va. He died at the age of 46, the youngest age of any other President.

The splendid story of the J. F. Kennedy Peace Forest in Israel is being retold in the pages of the Sunday Post in honor and tribute to the late President Kennedy, and in remembrance of his birthday on May 29. It also shows the immense admiration and respect the people of Israel held for President Kennedy.

This story is also of immense historical value for the people of this nation and for the veterans of all wars, since the late President was a heroic patriot, who loved and fought for his country and to maintain and preserve the American Way of Life. He was a martyr to the cause of Civil Rights and a defender of the rights of millions of American Negroes as well as the rights of the people of Israel to have a national homeland of their own where they could live in peace and in the observance of the faith of their fathers.

IN MEMORIAM  
(By Anthony Cama)

(A lyrical poem to the late martyred and beloved, first Catholic President of the United States of America)

O, Valiant dream, so beautiful, so great,  
at rest in sweet repose, a sacred sleep.  
O, martyred heart that kissed the hand of

fate  
and gently smiled where mortals grieve and weep.

To you, they passed the cup of love divine  
and so you gave of love so much, too much,  
and out of Ireland's green you drew The Sign  
that all the earth be fragrant at your touch.  
We kneel and mourn, this 29th of May—  
upon this land, so close the stoic flame  
of stars and petals of the Rosary we say  
in sad symphonic calling of your name.

O, President! O, President, your nation cries  
with splintered sunbeams and the rainbow's  
rain

that spider-webs the teardrops in our eyes  
and scales the mountain tops and hills of  
pain!

O President! O, President, at rest in hollowed  
grave,

among the thousands, veterans like you.  
You fought the tyrants and you helped the  
slave,

For God and man your faith was bright  
and true.

To heaven we shall lift your deathless light,  
eternal flame of glory on this sod,  
You gave this nation star lanes in the night  
and now your spirit leads us . . . straight  
to God.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND  
INDIAN AMERICANS

HON. JOHN B. CONLAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1974

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Speaker, many people unfortunately have the mistaken impression that Indian Americans living on reservations are all poverty-stricken wards of the Government with no means of self-support. As the Congressman with more Indian constituents than any other, I can say with pride that this is simply not true.

Free enterprise is flourishing on Indian reservations. Thousands of American Indians are working on and off tribal lands for Indian-owned businesses and for companies employing large numbers of Indians.

Peabody Coal, General Dynamics, Fairchild Industries, and other large companies employ reservation Indians in Arizona and New Mexico. And tribally owned companies have likewise provided many Indian jobs and helped raise living standards for Indian Americans.

Marvin L. Franklin, assistant to the Interior Secretary for Indian Affairs, himself an Indian, has written a heartening report on growing economic opportunities for Indians in the current issue of *Nation's Business*. Mr. Franklin is a former Iowa tribal official and petroleum company executive, and knows well what economic partnership between private industry and government has done to better the lives of native Americans.

I share with my colleagues Franklin's

article and the accompanying feature story about Cochise's great-grandson, who is helping get Indians into private industry.

[From *Nation's Business*, June 1974]  
PAYROLLS: AN ANSWER TO THE INDIAN  
MILITANTS

(By Marvin L. Franklin)

Out in the heart of the sprawling Navajo Indian reservation in eastern Arizona is a huge sawmill. From the reservation forests of stately ponderosa pine, trucks haul enormous logs to the mill, where roaring band saws slice them into lumber—about 350,000 board feet a day.

The sawmill is wholly owned by the Navajo Tribe, and is operated by Navajo Forest Products Industries, organized in 1958. About 400 members of the tribe are employed in the operation, with payroll of around \$3 million. The trees are "harvested" to ensure an unending supply of logs for the future.

"Forty years ago I was living in a hogan trying to raise sheep, when the government came out and killed our sheep to make prosperity," a grizzled Navajo logger relates, recalling a New Deal effort to bolster Depression farm prices by reducing production. He adds, with a grin: "This is a better way!"

At Stilwell, Okla., Cherokee Nation Industries makes electrical switches and relays for Western Electric Co. Western Electric loaned the Indians a company manager, who selected the first employees and put them through job training. The enterprise, entirely owned by the Cherokees, started with eight workers and now has 192.

Recently, Cherokee Nation Industries completed a second plant, at Talequah, Okla. It produces calculators for the Corvus Corp., of Dallas, Texas, and assembles components for IBM. Leo Walkington, general manager of Cherokee Nation Industries, notes happily that its contracts with Corvus call for production of 1,500 desk model and 4,000 hand model calculators weekly.

These are typical examples of how a program of bringing industrial plants to Indian communities is creating jobs and lifting standards of living for the "original Americans."

The Indian industrial program has enlisted the hearty support of American businessmen, who believe that employment under free enterprise is better than paternalistic handouts.

I also find that it is the best possible answer to the militant Indians who seized the Bureau of Indian Affairs building in Washington and did such senseless damage to facilities, equipment and records in November, 1972; and who later seized the community of Wounded Knee on the Sioux Reservation in South Dakota with destruction of homes, a church and other buildings.

TRAINING AND LOANS

The industrial program began in 1953, when Glenn L. Emmons, a Gallup, N. Mex., banker, became Indian commissioner. It was obvious to Mr. Emmons and his associates that the biggest difficulty in such a program was the Indians' lack of training for skilled trades. To remedy this situation, Congress in 1956 passed legislation authorizing the Bureau of Indian Affairs to give Indians, chiefly between the ages of 18 and 25, vocational and apprenticeship instruction, with special provision for on-the-job training.

Loans to tribes, to be used to build industrial plants, also were authorized. In 1957, a Branch of Industrial Development was established in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to help sell American businessmen the idea of hiring Indian workers. The program has had the enthusiastic support of every Administration, of Congress and of Indian Bureau officials, since it began.

My experience in my native Oklahoma convinced me that bringing industrial plants to the reservation areas is the best solution to the problem of Indian unemployment. In the early 1960s, I was made director of "cooperative projects" for Phillips Petroleum Co., my employer for many years. My task was to work with federal and state governments, and with businessmen, to create jobs for disadvantaged people, especially Indians.

I began to encourage the organization of Indian companies and their employment of Indian workers, all within the framework of the free enterprise system. In the years that followed, I assisted at the beginning of about 75 companies, some with as few as five employees and some with 500 or more. By and large, these companies have proved successful, with profitable distribution and sale of their products.

A similar success story is being written by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

As of this point, a total of 250 companies have taken advantage of the BIA industrialization program to establish plants in Indian communities. In addition, during the last five years, more than a hundred major commercial projects, Indian owned and managed, have been set up. Combined annual payrolls have grown to about \$35 million, with a potential employment capacity of more than 15,000 jobs.

A good example of the program's success can be found among the Choctaw Indians of Mississippi. In the 1830s, President Andrew Jackson decided upon a harsh policy—to compel the transfer of the major tribes living east of the Mississippi River to an area set aside as the "Indian Territory." It was west of the Louisiana Purchase, "where the white man will never want to live," said he President. He ordered soldiers to round up the Choctaws, along with the Creeks of Alabama and Florida, the Cherokees of North Carolina, the Seminoles of Georgia and the Chickasaws of Tennessee, and the long "trail of tears" began for these so-called "civilized tribes."

About half of the 2,500 Choctaws refused to be rounded up. They simply fled to the woods and the marshes, and there they stayed. Today, descendants of these hardy people live on farms and in villages near Philadelphia, Miss. Many of their families have been living in poverty for generations, trying to scratch out a living as sharecroppers.

Now that is changing. In March, 1967, through the joint effort of the local Indian Bureau agency and Emmett York, Choctaw tribal chief, the Garan Co., of New York, established a plant in Philadelphia to manufacture boys' wear. It agreed to employ Indian workmen.

"Given proper training, these Choctaws make as proficient operators as any in the land," says Claud Kuykendall, plant superintendent.

WORKING WOMEN

Go out to the broad tableland near Shiprock, N. Mex., on the Navajo reservation, and you'll find a big plant of the Fairchild Camera and Instrument Co., of Syosett, N.Y. Here about 800 Navajos, 80 per cent of them women, assemble transistors and integrated circuits essential to the functioning of radio and television sets, computers, and electronic devices in planes, missiles and spacecraft. The firm's building, equipped with every modern convenience, covers 33,600 square feet, and cost \$1.2 million, paid for by the Navajo Tribe with a big low-interest loan from the Economic Development Administration. Fairchild has approximately \$1.8 million invested in machinery and equipment.

The workers peer through microscopes, performing such exacting tasks as soldering wires smaller than human hair.

"Not more than 5 per cent of our employees

ever had a steady job before," says Paul W. Driscoll, plant manager. "Yet our Indian people have unmatched skill and patience."

On the Seminole Indian reservation near Hollywood, Fla., an electronic-connector plant, leased by the tribe to the Amphipol industrial division of Bunker-Ramo Corp., of Chicago, employs 18 members of the tribe. These Seminoles are descendants of Indians who, under the famed Chief Osceola, fled from U.S. Army troops in the 1830s. They only recently made "peace" with the government by cooperating in Bureau programs, including industrial development. One Seminole declares:

"Some so-called 'friend of Indians' wanted us to keep making little Indian curios to sell to tourists, so we wouldn't lose our native culture. But now our workers earn many times what they did in that sort of thing."

Underwear, hosiery, pants and many more items of clothing are manufactured by established companies branching into the Indian communities. Western Superior Mills, a division of the BVD Co., of New York, operates a plant near Winslow, Ariz., making, packaging and distributing men's and boys' underwear. The plant was built by the Hopi Tribe at a cost of \$1.5 million on a 200-acre site donated by citizens of Winslow. The building covers 120,000 square feet, making it the largest in northern Arizona.

Indians of both the Hopi and Navajo Tribes, traditional rivals, work side by side at the machines. The women earn from \$2 to \$3.30 an hour. The plant manager, Della Pecore, who refers to herself as a "refugee from the Seventh Ave. New York garment district," says: "The Navajo and Hopi are not rivals in this plant, because they're all making a good living!"

Among many other long-established firms migrating by branch plant to Indian country is The Harry Winston Minerals Co., of New York. This firm located a plant near Chandler, Ariz., and employs a score of Gila River Indians cutting and polishing diamonds.

Many of the workers have had long experience fashioning native stone jewelry.

#### FURNITURE IN THE FOREFRONT

Furniture making is now in the forefront of new jobs for Indian families. In early 1966 a survey disclosed that of 772 male Yakima Tribe members, at Wapato, Wash., only about 100 had anything like regular jobs, and 62 of these were common laborers. Aided by federal loans, the Yakima tribal council built a \$772,000 plant for White Swan Industries, Los Angeles furniture manufacturers. Today this company employs 200 Indians, and pays the tribe a monthly rental of \$6,500.

Members of the Warm Springs Tribe in Oregon entered the jet age in 1969 when the Tektronix Co., of Beaverton, Oregon, set up a plant on their reservation. About 40 Indians are employed, assembling oscilloscopes—highly sophisticated instruments that plot electrical graphs.

Millions of dollars of annual income flow into Indian communities through development of resources on the reservations, such as the majestic stands of timber, and deposits of coal, oil, gas, copper and uranium—buried treasures of the ages. Timber and wood products lead this type of industrial development.

Among many other new industries in Indian areas are:

A meat-packing plant established at Yankton, S. Dak., by the Yankton Sioux Industries, which processes carcasses from nearby cattle feeders; The Lummi Aquaculture Co., located on the Lummi Reservation near Bellingham, Wash., which raises fish to market size; Great Western Industries at Browning, Mont., which makes pens, pencils and felt markers, primarily for sale to government agencies, and which employs 83 Indians out of 89 workers; and for the Chickasaw Tribe of Oklahoma, creation of a modern recreation area which includes a motel at Sulphur, Okla.

Essential to the success of the plan for In-

dian employment has been establishment of industrial parks on or near reservations, to attract new plants. An outstanding example is the Pima-Chandler Industrial Park in the Gila River Indian community near Coolidge, Ariz. It covers 543 acres developed with good roads, water mains, power lines and sewerage. A Southern Pacific Railroad spur runs through the park.

Since December, 1968, five plants have located in this area, in which as many as 70 per cent of the Indian workers had been unemployed. The plants' products include metal shipping containers, brass valves for marine use, and spider-thin wire for the electronics industry. About 800 formerly unemployed Pima and Maricopa Indians work in these plants.

Every industry's arrival at an Indian reservation signals the development of numerous other new jobs. Families must have housing, furniture, food, utilities and many other items for daily living. Employment creates its own chain reaction of prosperity.

The industrial employment program has spurred the biggest homebuilding boom in Indian history. While the plants are usually located near good highways, and some Indian workmen commute in car pools, many families—once on steady payrolls near a town with modern facilities—decide to move to town.

Apartment houses and other housing projects dot the industrial parks and local residential areas, as Indian families begin to enjoy the conveniences of modern living.

#### TEAMWORK PROVIDES WORK

Locating plants for Indian employment is a team project for federal and state agencies, business firms and the Indians themselves. Tribal councils on every reservation have been consulted about their resources and potential labor supplies. Indian Bureau officials, cooperating with commissions for Indian employment in every state with a large Indian population, advise firms as to available sites for buildings, and supplies of water, gas, power and fuel. They furnish information on motor, rail and air carriers to provide marketing access.

The usual procedure calls for the Indian tribe to erect the building for the plant according to specifications of the firm that agrees to lease it. Funds for the plant's cost are generally loaned by BIA or the Economic Development Administration, and often there are generous donations from nearby communities, too. The company furnishes the equipment and management, and lease payments to the tribe usually are sufficient to retire the government agency's loan.

The firm agrees to give hiring preference to tribe members.

"Thus, everybody involved benefits," Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton points out. "Business firms tap a new labor pool, with workers capable of the most exacting operations. The Indians find steady jobs and new prosperity. The public helps a minority group to help itself, and is repaid by reduced welfare rolls and higher standards of living for Indian families."

#### COCHISE'S GREAT-GRANDSON: TRIUMPHS IN TWO WORLDS

Some Indians toss off Sam Kinsolving as a *bellacena*, which is an Indian lingua franca equivalent of the black activists' "Uncle Tom." The word literally means apple, and militants use it for fellow Indians who accept and thrive in the white man's world. Its broad meaning is: "Red on the outside, white on the inside."

But Sam is something else.

True, he is a success in the white man's world. He is a planner, and recruiter of Indian employees, for the Ingalls Shipbuilding division of Litton Industries, in Pascagoula, Miss. Ingalls is carrying out two sizable U.S. Navy contracts there, for 30 destroyers of the Spruance class and for five general purpose amphibious assault craft.

But above all, he is an Apache. Sam, 42, is a great-grandson of the famous chieftain, Cochise, and intensely proud of it. And he believes that traits which spell success in the white man's world belong to the Indian's world, too.

No easy task, this undertaking of Sam Kinsolving in recruiting. He has so far talked with men of 47 tribes west of the Mississippi about accepting employment in the Pascagoula area, especially with Ingalls.

The result? The U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs reports a "rapid influx" of Indians to Pascagoula in the last two years, with more than 600 now working in the area, most of them for Ingalls.

From the beginning of the recruiting effort, which was spurred by Ingalls' need for good workers as well as by a desire to make a contribution to Indian welfare, Sam knew the scrutiny he would get from all sides would put a microscope to shame.

After all, he has a white man's surname. It comes from his mother's side of the family (she is white; her father was an Episcopal bishop in Arizona). Sam's father adopted it—Apaches traditionally had no surnames—to avoid modern-day legal problems.

Apaches are an extremely proud tribe, and unless one can prove he's at least half Apache, they put him beyond the pale in contrast to, say, the Cherokees, who will accept as Indian a person claiming only one sixteenth Indian blood. But Sam is inside the pale. On his father's side, he is all-Apache.

How does Sam go about recruiting?

"When I go in the reservations," he says, "the first thing I have to do is get the 'mocassin telegraph' working. It's one of the most efficient communications systems in the world. Word gets around that I'm there, and that I'll be in certain places. First one, and then more, drop in on me and we talk."

"They ask all kinds of questions. Whether we have an Indian center in Pascagoula—and we do. Whether other Indians find it agreeable, not only the work, but living so far away from home grounds. What kind of schools for their kids, and how do other kids accept Indian children? That last one is easy, as Indian youngsters are not racially conscious—they play easily with blacks, whites, Mexicans, Chinese—and by doing so they often set the good example."

The Indian center is a place where Indians can gather, sing their old songs, have the trappings of their special cultures. "It's sort of an oxygen source," as Sam appraises it, "where they can go to be replenished. It gives them a comforting whiff of the reservation."

Sam also tells potential recruits about other benefits—relocation allowances which they get from BIA, and money BIA provides for them to buy tools they need.

"Mostly, though," he says, "I emphasize that we want people with honesty, resolve, pride, courage, responsibility to themselves and their families. These are traditional Indian values, tightly bound in their culture. I tell them that exhibiting these characteristics is a way to prove that the white man didn't invent them."

The biggest bloc of Indian workmen at Ingalls are welders—more than 30 as Sam totals them up. The others range from shipfitters and carpenters to mechanics, junior draftsmen, production managers and planners, he says—"a rather good cross section of what we have to have here to build ships."

Ingalls President Ned Marandino is a hard-driving executive who focuses on production schedules and is far from the type who would take kindly to employees who didn't pull their weight.

He is one of Sam Kinsolving's champions. "I couldn't do it without that feeling at the top," Sam says, "because if the Indians ever thought for one minute they were not respected employees, the whole program would fall flat and they would vanish back into the reservations from which they came."